"The Catholic Question in the United States"

Vol I

BQX
4321
+G8
v.1

J. J. V.

John J. Vogel

The Catholic Question
in the
United States

by

The Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday,
(Professor of Church History
at the
Catholic University of America)

ST. ARCHABBEY LIBRARY
ST. MEINRAD IND.

108387

BQX4321
+G8
v.1

The Catholic Question
in the
United States

Contents

Article 1 ....The Question Stated
Article 11 .... Origin of the Catholic Question
Article 111 .... Catholic Question in the Colonies
Article 1V ...... Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty (Geo. Calvert)
Article V ....(Cecilius and Leon. Calvert)
Article V1 .... (Roger Williams)
Article V11 .... (William Penn)
Article V111 ....(Thomas Dongan)
Article 1X .... Colonial Attitude Towards Catholic Church (1690-1763)
Article X ..Religious Liberty on Eve of American Revolution (1763-1774)
Article X1 ....Catholicism and Democracy
Article X11 .... Catholic Background to Declaration of Independence
Article X111.......... Catholic Participation in Revolution (1775-1783)
Article X 1V ...Constitution of U. S. & Religious Equality (1783-1844)
Article XV ..Rallying-Protestant Forces vs. Religious Liberty (1820-44)
Article XV1 ....John England, Champion of Religious Equality
Article XV11 .... Republic in Danger (1826-36)
Article XV111..........Anti-Catholic Literature
Article X1X .... Pioneer Catholic Press (1810-61)
Article XX..........Native Americanism (1844)
Article XX1...Catholic Question before the Provincial Councils (1829-49)
Article XX11.....Archbishop John Hughes, Champion of Religious Liberty.
Article XX111 ....Know-Nothingism
Article XX1V ....Recognition of Papacy by American Government (1847-67)
Article XXV ....Catholic Church and Slave Question
Article XXV1 Catholic Church and Civil War (1861-65)
Article XXV11 Chas. O'Conor, 1st Catholic Presidential Candidate(1872)
Article XXV111 .... Orestes A. Brownson (1803-1876)
Article XX1X ...."The Faith of Our Fathers"
Article XXX .... Paulists
Article XXX1 The "Catholic World"
Article XXX11 A Critical Year 1876
Article XXX111 The Attack on Catholic Education
Article XXX1V (Councils-Baltimore)The Catholic Question and the Plenary
Article XXXV The Voice of Catholic Laity (1889)

AP 24 '70

The Catholic Question
in the
United States

Contents (Cont.)

Article XXXVl............ The American Protective Association (1893)
Article XXXVll .... Conversions
Article XXXVlll ...."Poisoning the Wells" (Encyclopedias)
Article XXXlX .A Trial Balance-K.C.Commission on Religious Prejudices
Article XL ....Catholicism and Americanism
Article XLl.. Ku Klux Klan
Article XLll ....The.Church and the Republic

Finis.

Article 1--The Question Stated.

"Our Sunday Visitor," January 8, 1928.

It is now close to a hundred years since Bishop John England, the first great apologist of the Catholic Faith in the United States, boldly stated that there was then one fact too notorious to be screened--that against such of the citizens of these States as profess the doctrines of our Church, there existed a feeling of, and in some cases, a deadly, hostility.

"The assertion," he said, "is a strong one, but common candor calls for it. No matter what may be the differences--and sometimes they are bitter enough--that distract occasionally our separated brethren, in denouncing Catholicity throughout the length and breadth of the land, there is found a common ground upon which the discordant camps can meet and bend in amity; nor can the charges be honestly confined, as the phrase would suggest, to what is called the religious press of the country; for we think we could make out the case that the political press is to a considerable extent tinged with that tone of bigotry which unfortunately but too signally marks the former.

Not Concerned With Politics

"With politics we, of course, have nothing to do, who may be the successful candidate for any office in the gift of the people, as little; though as citizens of the United States, we reserve to ourselves the privilege of exercising when we think fit the rights belonging to such. We would only remark then that is is rather ominous to find the spirit of that press which should be the first to arrest the march of intolerance, teeming with polemics, descending on the eve of an election, for party purposes, to embitter a spirit which on such occasions is but too highly inflamed, by blending politics with religion."

This reference to a presidential campaign of the early part of the last century is well worthy of study to all those readers whose knowledge of the persistency of anti-Catholicism in the United States is a slender one. It helps considerably in understanding the "Catholic Question" in this country if we begin with a little-known fact; namely, that the attacks which have become more thorough and more subtle through the years; but that they are the same attacks, identical not only in what they mean to effect, but identical even in words and terms. There is only one difference--the absence of the words "Papist" and "Popery." But the spirit has never changed, it is the same--strong, unbending, all-embracing, and far-flung.

Old Charges Revived

When in July, 1927, the leader of the largest anti-Catholic organization the world has seen since the advent of Protestantism, asserts his two-fold charge against the Church, he is but repeating word for word the shibboleth of the Stonemen, the American Protective Association, theKnow-nothings, the Native-Americans, and that first organized anti-Catholic group in the new Republic, the American Protestant Association of 1830. He is repeating word for word the subject of the famous debate between the future Archbishop Hughes and the Rev. Dr. Breckenridge at Philadelphia in 1835, and the debate between Archbishop Purcell and the Rev. Mr. Campbell at Cincinnati in 1837. These two fundamental points in American anti-Catholic politics are: 1. The Roman Catholic Church, in doctrines, teachings, and practices, is not in harmony with American principles and institutions; and 2. America cannot safely or wisely endow a man adhering to that Church with political power.

Charges Often Answered

In some ways it is of greater import to Catholics and non-Catholics alike to know the story of the rise and persistency of this charge of potential Catholic disloyalty to the nation than to be able to furnish learned historical or philosophical answers to the same. The charge has been answered a multitude of times in this and other lands where Protestantism has a dominating voice

or influence. The multitude of answers given in this and succeeding generations will curb or destroy the prejudices of many; but the stark fact is that so long as Protestantism lives--and it will probably always live, if not as a religious force at least as a political engine--the answer to the charge will never be fully accepted, except by those Protestant leaders and divines who have studied the Catholic Question and who are noble-hearted enough to admit, and sometimes to admit publicly, that our beloved country need have no hesitant fears of the loyalty of its Catholic citizens.

The moment that Catholic loyalty to American ideals is accepted, that moment political Protestantism as such loses the only inherent force which gives it unity, life and vigor. Silence the accusation of double allegiance or potential disloyalty made against Catholics in Protestant pulpits and Protestant literature, and the whole tissue of lies and slander of the past century and a half of American life would wither and die.

Millions Believe Misrepresentations

The initial thing, therefore, for the Catholic who wishes to understand the persistency of this fundamental misrepresentation of his Faith, is to realize that millions of his fellow-citizens actually believe it. It is as much a part of their religion as of their politics. The majority of those outside the Church who reflect on the question of Catholic American loyalty, make, perhaps unaware of its significance, a distinction between: (1) The Church as a theology representing the unceasing conciliation of divine truth with the unceasing intellectual needs of mankind; (2) as a spiritual force leading men to thoughts and aspirations and ideals beyond this material world; and (3) as a polity, that is as an independent and sovereign corporate organization, of whom the supreme leader is the Vicar of Christ, the Pope.

There is a quarrel, of course, with Catholic doctrines and that quarrel is becoming more widespread as each day passes; for every nightfall finds the ranks of believing Protestants fewer than the day before. This doctrinal quarrel is no longer between Protestantism and Catholicism but between Christianity and neo-pagan-

ism. This aspect of the objection to the doctrines of the Church will grow as pagan ideals invade the non-Catholic camp. There is less antagonism to the spiritual forces of Catholicism.

Indeed, it is these forces, which make for the sanctities of life, that are praised by the most unexpected Protestant groups; and our political leaders back to George Washington have frequently expressed their high satisfaction over the moral and social influence of the Church in the land.

But it is with the third of these distinctions that the age-long Protestant discontent is mainly concerned. Catholics may fail to perceive this distinction. Very often we find our Catholic writers holding up for emulation a Protestant minister who praises the Church under the first or second of these aspects, but who is as firmly fixed in his attitude as others against what he styles the political designs of Rome. Protestants fail to understand the Church when they believe that such a three-fold distinction has a reality in Catholicism. All three are one and the same by virtue of the unity which rules Catholic thought and action.

Basis of Protestant Fears

It is on account of this spiritual allegiance to the head of this corporate society which to Protestants bears in its name the proof of its alienship--the Roman Catholic Church--that so many millions of Americans fear the power of the Church in the United States. It would be absurd to say that these objectors to religious equality are not sincere in their distrust. It would be equally absurd to conclude that they are consciously violating the spirit of the Federal Constitution in their stand that Catholics be barred from high official position in our government on account of their Faith.

The purpose of this series of essays is to bring, if possible, a clearer understanding of allegiance of Catholics to the spiritual head of their Church and to awaken a livelier interest on the part of the Catholics in the history of their Faith in this country. "My people," said the Prophet Osee, "have been silent, because they had no knowledge." There is, of course, slim excuse either for the Catholic not to know the story of

the Church's gallant and almost victorious struggle through the ages, especially in our own land, to spread the sweetness and light of her doctrines, or for the Protestant not to understand by this time, after four hundred years of argument and controversy, that there can never be, as there never has been, the possibility of any conflect between the temporal allegiance the Catholic gives to those in authority in the government and the spiritual loyalty he is bound to give to those placed over him by Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church.

Few Know Story of Constitution

One of the greatest weaknesses, if not the greatest, in the popular knowledge of the American Republic and of the Constitution which gives it life, is that few of our citizens have bothered to read or to study the story of those days in the summer of 1787 when the little band of delegates met at Philadelphia to frame the document which Gladstone called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." And yet, while no patriotic American would claim that the leadership of the nation should be denied any man who possesses constitutional qualifications, few realize that it would fall far short of an exaggeration to say that all the preliminary debates in the formation of the Constitution can easily be reduced to one--that of double allegiance on the part of the citizen. The two leading parties today can be traced back to the two opposing views of thought on the interpretation of the Constitution in this regard; and the great work of the Supreme Court of the United States, the "balance-wheel of the Constitution," has been exactly this--to prove and to keep on proving that there is no danger of a conflict in the double allegiance of the citizen to his own state and to the national government. In this sense, the Supreme Court is a continuous constitutional convention with the high prerogative of forestalling the danger of conflict in the dual allegiance of our people. The dual allegiance of the Catholic American can never give rise to an analogous danger, for his two allegiances are on different planes, the one spiritual, and the other political.

Loyalty of Catholics Futile

An unbroken record of a century and a half of Catholic patriotism should by thistime lay low this

ghost of political bigotry. And yet the Catholic Question in the United States does not seem to have been answered, even by the overwhelming cooperation of Catholics, in time of war and in time of peace, in preserving the ideals of the Republic and in handing on to succeeding generations the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. There could be no Catholic Question in our land if our Protestant fellow-citizens hearkened to the voices of our great leaders, Archbishop John Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons, Cardinal O'Connell, Cardinal Hayes, and many others. There can be no Catholic Question when every Catholic citizen subscribes with all his heart to the declaration of John Ireland: "My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church--Catholicism, integral and unalloyed, unswerving and soul-swaying--the Catholicism, if I am to put it into more positive and concrete form, taught by the supreme chieftain of the Catholic Church, the Bishop and Pope of Rome. My civil and political faith is that of the republic of the United States--Americanism, purest and brightest, yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of none other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrifice by none other citizen, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war American's Star Spangled Banner."

Article 11--The Origin of the Catholic Question

"Our Sunday Visitor," January 15, 1928.

"The Catholic Question" in America is a legacy of distrust and misunderstanding bequeathed to all those who have descended from, or who have been influenced by, the colonial Puritanism of New England.

Puritanism did not create this misunderstanding; for, as has rightly been said by a recent anti-Catholic antagonist, the Catholic Question in America is an aftermath of the Reformation, which was essentially a struggle between two opposing forms of thought, one of which relied on Authority, and the other on the Private Mind. But American Puritanism gave to the anti-Catholic viewpoint several distinctive attributes which make it peculiarly a problem apart from the Protestantism of other lands.

Puritanism Hard to Define.

Puritanism is so varied in theory and in practice that it escapes exact definition. So much has been written within recent years on the Puritan and his ways that we are able to approach somewhat more closely to the minds and hearts of these men and women who played so vital a part in the foundation of our political government.

Most of these recent writers, however, come to bury the Puritan, not to praise him. Gradually the fine old tragic lines that delineated these early Americans are being blurred in the process; and as the glare of ridicule and contempt reaches the unlearned, the Puritan is emerging in no pleasant light. It has now become a commonplace in American literature that there were some ugly deformities in the political and religious life of these pioneers.

It is not our purpose to review these stark uglinesses; nor is it necessary. The task can apparently be left to the descendants themselves of the Puritans. What is essential to our task is to try to understand one aspect of the Puritan mind--the politico-religious aspect; for politics and religion have never been dissolved in the Puritan partnership. Puritanism was a life as well as a philosophy--religious and political. While it would overstrain certain factors in that life and thought to claim that Puritanism was largely a thing of hates and animosities, nevertheless, the honest defenders of these earliest Americans cannot safely deny that the very life-blood of Puritanism as a religion contained one dominating current--the hatred for "Popery."

Puritanism at its best was the best there is in Protestantism and Protestantism's most accurate equivalent is 'No Popery," since that term meant to the Protestant mind everything that was Catholic--prayers, practices, ritual, discipline, literature, and ecclesiastical government--particularly the last. Not to understand the "No Popery" of the colonial epoch of our history (1607-1776) is to miss completely one of the main elements of the religious life of modern America. A survey of the latest and best Manuals of American History reveals their curious silence in this respect.

Origin of Protestantism.

Essentially, Protestantism was a protest--a protest originally directed against certain political disorders which had crept into the Catholic Church; later, it became a protest against certain Catholic doctrines or articles of faith; and later still, a formal protest issued at the Diet of Speyer (1529) against further tolerance being granted to Catholics in all those lands which had gone over to the Reformation. It was at this time that the name "Protestant" arose, and the protest itself meant practically this: No Catholic prince or lord was to be permitted to hinder the progress of the Reformed religion within his own territory; no Protestant prince could be compelled to grant political and religious equality to

Catholics in his own land.

To come now to the home of the Puritan--England. With the passage of the two Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559, Queen Elizabeth's government accomplished two things: first, they gave to the Queen supreme jurisdiction in religious affairs; and second, they standardized religious worship and discipline in accordance with the views of the Edwardine reformers. The immediate effect of the two Acts was to make the newly-established Church of England a department of the government and to outlaw the Catholic Faith in the realm. How the Catholics suffered under the legal disabilities created by the Acts does not enter into our story. We are interested chiefly in the fact that the new English Church was a kind of compromise made up of Catholic and Protestant factors. This religious compromise was not satisfactory to one group in the Anglican Church, and the opposition thus created has lasted until our own day and is intimately connected with most of the political history of Great Britain and Ireland.

The Bitter-Enders.

There was present, therefore, at the birth of the Anglican Church a group of Protestants who were determined to carry the principles of the Reformation to the bitter end in England. Their purpose was to rid the Established Church of every vestige of worship and discipline which in any way might recall the Catholic days of yore. Through their efforts, the Church of England was to be "purified" of all lingering "Popish" elements, and the episcopal system of Church government was to be supplanted by Calvin's more democratic system of congregational administration. The discontented Protestants who wished to effect these changes whilst remaining members of the State Church, were offensively called "Puritans." There were others who rebelled against the close union of Church and State set up by the Acts of 1559. These latter separated from the Anglican communion and were called Independents, Separatists and later Congregationalists.

From this latter group came in 1620 to Plymouth the justly-famed Pilgrim Fathers, and some eight years later they were followed by the forerunners of the Puritan immigration of 1628-1640. The history of these two

movements--the Congregationalists of Plymouth and the Presbyterians of Salem--is one of the most interesting in all American annals. In spite of the instinctive prejudice the Puritan mode of life and thought arouses in the minds of many Americans, there is no denying the fact that, with all his grim aggression toward those who differed with him, the Puritan stands at the threshold of American history bearing in his hands some of the noblest gifts ever brought to our shores. One of these gifts had come over to him from his medieval Catholic ancestors, mixed, it is true, with the alloy of his hatred for the Faith of Rome. That gift was his love of liberty.

Puritan Attitude Towards Catholicism.

It would be absurd to hold any longer that the Puritans, who gradually absorbed the communities set up by the Pilgrim Fathers, had come to the New World with the single-hearted desire to found a state wherein liberty would be the watchword. Worldly motives, and those mostly selfish, were not absent. Their original purpose, as their leaders expressed it, was to found in the New World "a bulwark against the Kingdom of anti-Christ." Anti-Christ meant Rome, and Rome meant "Popery." The Pope was "the man of sin." The ministrations of the Church were superstitious and idolatrous. Mass was a blasphemy. The invocation of the saints was a device of Satan. Catholics were the enemies of God's truth. The term commonly applied to them was "ignorant and obstinate papists." The Pope was the world's worst tyrant. Catholics were treacherous, and would not scruple to break their word with heretics. No office of state, no position of public trust, might safely be confided to them. The whole aim of the Catholic was to control the government of every state wherein he resided in goodly numbers in order to renew the bloody Inquisition and to exterminate all heretics.

All these invectives saw their origin in Germany at the outset of the Protestant Revolt. They were embodied in that first great Protestant apology, the "Centuries" of Magdeburg, published by the Lutheran Flacius between 1556 and 1564. The earliest English Protestant writer to be influenced by the Magdeburg histories was John Foxe, the author of the notorious "Acts and Monuments

of the Christian Martyrs," which he published in 1563. Although thoroughly discredited today, even in Protestant circles, the "Book of Martyrs" as it was frequently called, was almost as well known to the Puritans of England and of New England as the Bible. The historian of the Puritans, Neal, says that "no book ever gave such a mortal wound to Popery as this; it was dedicated to the queen (Elizabeth), and was in such high repute that it was ordered (1571) to be set up in the churches, where it raised in the people an invincible horror and detestation of that religion which had shed so much innocent blood."

Foxe's "Book of Martyrs."

The "Book of Martyrs" is one of the main sources of the intense hatred for all things Catholic in English-speaking countries. It is Foxe's book which stands in the shadow behind many of the "No Popery" laws enacted by our colonial legislatures. And it is the memory, dimmed though it be, of the anti-Catholicism it engendered among our American pioneers, that gives vigor to the same spirit today.

In the long line of battle between the opposing forces of Protestantism and Catholicism, the two armies have fought their bloodiest battles not at any doctrinal point, but upon the field of divergent political standpoints. Essentially, Protestantism is a State religion; it is nationalistic, intolerantly bound up with the State government. Catholicism's capital sin in the eyes of a Protestant government is that it is international in its religion and in its administration. In English-speaking countries, as Carlton J. H. Hayes has pointed out in his "Essays on Nationalism," anti-Catholicism has chiefly been based upon the inherent dread Protestantism has ever had for the international or supernational influence which radiates from Rome out across national borders.

"Since the days of Queen Elizabeth," he writes, "it has been the feeling and inmost conviction of generation after generation of Englishmen, Scotsmen and Americans that Catholics cannot be good citizens, and this feeling has found repeated expression not only in the penal laws of the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries, but in the Gordon riots, the 'no-popery' demonstrations, the activites of the British Kensitites, and the propaganda of a horde of American societies--the Know-Nothing Party, the American Protective Association, the Ku Klux Klan, etc. It is difficult, indeed impossible, for a fair-minded scholar to find in the history of the last three hundred years any occasion on which the Catholic minority among these nationalities have lagged behind their fellow-citizens in the discharge of civic obligations; invariably they have willingly borne their proportionate part of losses of blood and treasure in the national wars of their respective countries. Yet today Catholics in England, Scotland and the United States, though they are legally tolerated, are objects of popular suspicion, sometimes victims of social ostracism and political and educational discrimination, and always targets for vilification by professional itinerant lecturers and by cheap and widely-circulated publications. Just as Britishers still think it important to retain the legal prescription that their King, who has no power, shall be a'faithful Protestant,' so a sufficient number of Americans can be counted on to unite at a moment's notice to prevent the great powers of the presidency of the United States from being wielded by a Catholic American."

Root of All Anti-Catholic Agitation.

It is this identity of Protestantism with an exaggerated nationalism which lies at the root of all anti-Catholic movements in the United States. Puritanism in this country has suffered many changes since its advent to our shores in 1620, but in one essential element no change has become visible, namely, in its intolerant political attitude towards Catholics. This intolerance faded, it is true, before the liberalism of the Founders of the Republic, but only in its religious phase. A half-century of American political life was to pass before the lingering remnants of political proscriptions against the Catholic were removed from State Consitutions. To understand this anomaly, it is necessary to review the story of the Catholic Question in colonial America.

Article 111--The Catholic Question in the Colonies

(Our Sunday Visitor, January 22, 1928)

The transmission of the English "No Popery" spirit to the Colonies was effected through the preaching of the Puritan divines and by the spread of such collections of anti-Catholic diatribes as Foxe's "Book of Martyrs." We need not stop to analyze the "Book of Martyrs", although it is probable that not one in a hundred thousand of our American Catholics has ever seen the work.

Puritanism in New England, despite its varied and opposing forms, recognized a common enemy in the Catholic Church. The safety of its "Biblical Commonwealth" lay mainly in preserving the people from "Popery." A long series of legal enactments might now be cited to show how systematically that idea was kept before the people of the Colonies.

Anti-Catholic Legislation In New England.

Under the guise of a law against idolatry, the celebration of the Mass in Massachusetts was made punishable by death. In the New Haven and Connecticut settlements the law expressly forbade Catholics to enter. The fact that Catholics did not come to Puritan New England did not make the magistrates and ministers any the less apprehensive about the spread of "Popery". In 1634, John Endicott, one of the foremost leaders, ordered the red cross cut out of the English flag because it was a "Popish symbol. In 1647, Jesuits were forbidden to enter Massachusetts. The first offence meant banishment; the second, death. Cromwell's advent to power in 1649 brought a feeling of security to Puritanism, and it was during the Commonwealth that the general court of Massachusetts gave legal expression to its deep Puritan horror of all things savoring of "Popery" by making the observance of Christmas a punishable offence. Naturally, much of this animosity was directed to the neighboring French settlements in Maine and Canda. The Puritans, to use the words of their chronicler, Felt, were "fearful lest Romanism spread in North America," and their leaders had viewed with ominous forebodings the founding of Maryland as a refuge for the persecuted Catholics in the homeland, in 1634.

The restoration of Charles 11 to the throne of England (1660) cast the shadow of "Popery" again over New England, but with the downfall of the Catholic James 11 the and accession of William and Mary (1689), a new epoch of intolerance began in colonial America. There was more toleration for the dissenting Christian religious beliefs, but all the penal laws against the Catholics were more rigidly enforced.

Extension of the Persecution.

The Revolution of 1688 opened, then, a new era in the penal laws for the persecution of Catholics in England at home and in the England beyond the seas. The cruel Act of 1699 "for further preventing the growth of Popery" found its counterpart in all the American colonies, except Maryland, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania. The Stuart rising of 1715 increased the severity of the laws against Catholics and the fear of Jacobite plots and intrigues ran on to the outbreak of the French and Indian War in 1754.

During all these years--the heart of the colonial period of American History--the feeling against Catholics never relaxed its vigilance, and it was fed by an increasing series of attacks upon "Popery" in and out of the pulpit. Many of the sermons delivered were printed and widely read, and a catalogue of the books and pamphlets published up to the American War of Independence reveals the fact that almost two-thirds of these are filled with what Sanford H. Cobb, in his "Rise of Religious Liberty in America", calls the insane cry of 'No Popery'."

Intolerance in Virginia and Carolinas.

Outside of New England, when Virginia and the Carolinas were founded, the Established Church of England was established by law, and Catholics in these colonies met with the same intolerance under which their brethren in England suffered. Catholics had as little incentive to emigrate to Virginia and the Carolinas as they had to New England. The Virginia legislature enacted in 1642 a law of banishment against all priests who might come into the colony, as a safeguard against the danger of "infection" from Roman Catholic Maryland. It was Virginia which passed in 1756 the act "for disarming Papists", the same act containing a clause forbidding a Catholic to keep a horse above the value of £5. "Only a desire to annoy," says Cobb, "would seem to account for that provision." The Carolinas were not founded for the purpose of complete religious liberty, but Protestant dissenters

were permitted to enter, while Catholics were excluded from the colony. Georgia likewise granted liberty of conscience to all "except Papists".

In the other colonies founded under Protestant auspices, the history of religious equality or freedom of conscience is the same. In all of them except Rhode Island and Pennsylvania (Delaware was part of Pennsylvania until 1702), the history of religious equality or freedom of conscience differs little from the Puritan establishments of New England or the Church of England establishments in the South.

New York's Law Against Priests.

Catholics were not wanted. With a short interlude under James 11 (1685-1688), when New York lived under the Charter of Liberties granted by the Catholic Governor Dongan, Catholics who came to the colony were not openly persecuted, but any priest found within the limits of the colony of New York after November 1, 1700, was to be condemned to life imprisonment. Should he escape and be caught, the penalty was death. Another law passed in 1701 excluded Catholics from holding office and from the right to vote.

In 1718, the ferocious Acts of the English Parliament against Catholics were made applicable to all the colonies, and after that date Catholic immigration to America was practically brought to a standstill. The few who lived in Maryland and in Pennsylvania were reduced to the political level of the slaves, although it was generally conceded at the time that the Catholics of these two colonies were preeminently the leading intellectual men of these provinces.

Maryland Law to Prevent Conversions.

In 1746, Governor Bladin of Maryland issued a proclamation in which any priest making converts to the Faith was declared a traitor to the colony. As a result of all this petty persecution, the Catholics of Maryland authorized Charles Carroll, the father of the Signer, in 1752, to apply to the French Government for a tract of land in Louisiana. The French and Indian War (1754-1763) caused another outbreak of legislation against the "Papists", and it is plainly visible in the newspapers of the time that colonial America was fast approaching the crisis of outlawing Catholics altogether in the British possessions along the Atlantic coast. Only the general discontent over

the various points of dispute between the Mother Country and the Colonies prevented this concerted anti-Catholic movement, and the Revolution in this sense may truly be said to have saved the small body of Catholics from extinction.

With the Treaty of Paris in 1763, Canada passed into the possession of the English, and with the exception of the island of New Orleans and two tiny islands in the Atlantic, England ruled everything east of the Mississippi River. The next eleven years were among the most perplexing in the history of British imperialism, and, as we shall see, the Catholic Question played an important part in the final decision which brought about the War of Independence and American freedom.

Before passing to these years, however, something should be said about a brighter page in the history of colonial intolerance towards the Catholics--religious freedom as practised in Maryland, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania. As we shall see in the next paper, unjust and inhuman as was the whole penal legislation in colonial America, there was a spirit at work which would eventually be enshrined in the American Constitution in 1787,--the recognition that without religious equality, the ship of state could not long keep from wreckage on the rocks of political disaster.

Article 1V--Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty:
1. George Calvert, First Lord Baltimore.

(Our Sunday Visitor, January 29, 1928)

Three Calverts shared in the founding of Maryland, the first colony in the future Republic to make the fundamental law of its government freedom of worship to all who believed in Jesus Christ--George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore (1579-1632), Cecil Calvert, his son, the second Lord Baltimore (1605-1675), and Leonard Calvert, the brother of Cecil, the first Governor of Maryland (1606-1637).

Much has been written--some of it in a spirit of bitterness--to dispute the right of the Calverts to the unique honor of being the first to enact and to practice the Christian law of liberty of conscience in the New World. In the first edition of his "History of the United States," Bancroft says: "Calvert deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent lawgivers of all ages. He was the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the employment of liberty of conscience; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects."

Maryland was the one spot, where "in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of a river, which, as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the State."

Exalted Position of the Calverts.

Of all the facts in American history which remain vexatious to the lingering Puritan anti-Catholicism of our day, none is more so than the exalted position of the Calverts in the foundation of religious liberty in America. One may choose at random any ten of the latest histories of the United States written for our secondary schools, colleges and universities, and it is remarkable how sedulously they are silent upon the fact that Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary, at the time it was founded, was the only home of religious liberty in the New World.

The Calverts themselves have fared badly at the hands of some Maryland historians, and yet no three characters in

the colonial period deserve a higher place among our pioneers. George Calvert stands apart from all the colonial founders in his determined effort to establish a province in the western world where Catholics and non-Catholics might live together in peace and concord. Certainly, none of the colonial founders, not even with the exception of William Penn, had so colorful a life as the first Lord Baltimore.

The First Lord Baltimore.

George Calvert was born of Protestant parents about the year 1579, in Yorkshire, England. At an early age he matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, and after graduating from that venerable institution, he made the usual "Grand Tour" of the English college man, returned to England and entered Parliament. James 1, the Protestant son of Mary Stuart, was then King, and Calvert soon found himself chosen as one of the inner circle of royal friends. in 1605, Calvert married, and shortly afterwards became private secretary to Sir Robert Cecil, Secretary of State. This was the year of the Gunpowder Plot to blow up the King and Parliament; and, although denounced by the Catholic leaders in the kingdom, the discovery led to a renewal of of the bloody persecution of Catholics. The manager of the Plot was Guy Fawkes and the date set for the explosion was November fifth.

Washington's Rebuke to Bigots.

It is interesting in the light of its influence upon the colonial American mind, to recall the fact that this day was the common holiday of all the colonies up to its suppression by George Washington after he took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge in 1775. The day was celebrated with fireworks of various kinds, and so when July Fourth became the nations's holiday, the fireworks were carried over as part of the ceremonies. Washington's order, dated November 5, 1775, reads as follows: "As the Commander-in-Chief has been apprised of a design formed for the observance of that religious and childish custom of burning the effigy of the Pope, he cannot help expressing his surprise that there should be officers and soldiers in this army so devoid of common sense as not to see the impropriety of such a step at this juncture;.....to be

insulting their (the Canadians') religion, is so monstrous as not be suffered or excused; indeed, instead of offering the most remote insult, it is our duty to address public thanks to these our brethren, as to them we are indebted for every late success over the common enemy in Canada."

Conversion of Calvert.

George Calvert took a part in the persecutions which followed the plot against the King in whose favor he rapidly advanced. Knighted in 1617, Calvert became Secretary of State two years later, and received from James l a large estate in County Longford Ireland. The religious controversies of those years between the Puritans and Anglicans centered men's minds on the old Faith which a half-century of brutal legislation could entirely subdue, and in 1624, Calvert asked that most engaging of all the English Catholic priests of the period, Sir Tobie Matthew, the converted son of the Anglican Archbishop of York, to receive him into the Church. Owing to the Test Oath, no Catholic could hold any public office under the crown, and Calvert resigned his secretaryship, although James l retained him as a privy councillor and later elevated him to the Irish peerage as Baron Baltimore of Baltimore, in County Longford.

The creation of the two Virginia Companies--the London branch and the Plymouth branch--in 1606, for the purpose of colonization in North America, was followed by the settlement of Jamestown in 1607, under the auspices of the London Company. This same year the Plymouth Company attempted a settlement in Maine and when this proved unsuccesful, the merchant adventures were reorganized and New England was thrown open to settlers. The first to come were the Pilgrim~~s~~ Fathers who set out on the "Mayflower," in September, 1620, and landed at Plymouth Rock on December 21. The whole venture, the details of which need not to be entered into here, focussed attention more than ever before upon the unjust legislation which had made exiles of these sturdy sons of England.

New England was a vague term in those days, and in 1620, Calvert purchased a part of Newfoundland which he called Avalon. The charter for Avalon, granted by James l in 1623, is silent on the question of religious disabilities, and it is surmised that Calvert, who wrote the Charter him-

self, was then contemplating his conversion to the Church and consequently wished this omission in order to afford a place in the New World for the persecuted Catholics in England.

Calvert's Tolerance.

Calvert spent about $100,000 in making a settlement (Ferryland) in Avalon, and in 1627, sailed for Newfoundland, accompanied by two secular priests. The Protestants of the colony were permitted to have their own minister. The following spring Calvert returned to England, and early in 1629, came out again to Avalon, bringing with him Lady Baltimore and his children. The severity of the winter and the failure of crops determined him to abandon the colony and seek land farther south. In the autumn of 1629, he sent his children back to England and sailed with Lady Baltimore and the leaders of the Avalon colony for Virginia, arriving at Jamestown, October 1, 1629. Here he was met with coldness and contempt by the Governor and Council and was told that he could not remain unless he took the two Protestant oaths of allegiance and supremacy. To take the latter was impossible to any loyal Catholic. He then sailed for England, and obtained from Charles 1 a grant of land on both sides of the Chesapeake, which was called Maryland in honor of Charles' Queen, Henrietta Maria. Before the great seal of England was affixed to the Charter, Lord Baltimore died (April 15, 1632), and was succeeded by his son, Cecilius, who became the second Lord Baltimore.

The Charter of Maryland.

The Charter of Maryland was the most extraordinary document ever issued by the English crown during the colonial period. Naturally, its religious clause has attracted the most attention from historians and has caused more discussion and debate than any similar clause in our colonial history. But there is another aspect of the Charter which is too often overlooked, even by Catholic defenders of Lord Baltimore's right to be classed as the first among the founders of America to establish religious freedom. This is the royal prerogative of the Charter itself. The Charter made Lord Baltimore almost absolute monarch of Maryland. He and his heirs were absolute lords and proprietors, and there was vested in his person all power--civil, military, naval, and ecclesiastical. He was in reality head of the State and of the Church. Charles 1 realized

the full force of the powers and prerogatives granted in the Charter, when he issued it to the son of Baltimore, Cecilius Calvert. He knew also that the second Lord Baltimore was as staunch a Catholic as his father and was the son-in-law of one of the most influential Catholics in England, the Earl of Arundel. Neither the King nor Cecilius Calvert could have had any doubt about the meaning of the famous fourth section of the Charter which gave to the Catholics of the realm for the first time since 1559, the surety of a refuge where they might worship God according to their conscience.

Maryland Land of Sanctuary.

Every conceivable attempt has been made by Protestant historians, both here and in England, to rob the Charter of this meaning. But the objective fact remains that practically all England knew at the time exactly what the first Lord Baltimore's plan was, namely, a land of sanctuary for persecuted Catholics at home and a place of refuge for all others who were then suffering, especially in the American colonies, for conscience's sake. Few non-Catholic American writers have done justice to George Calvert, Bancroft's hypocrisy is the most outstanding example. The very latest treatment of the question--that by Charles and Mary Beard in their "Rise of American Civilization"--is a deliberate attempt to blur the issue by casting suspicion on the motives of Charles 1 and the Calverts.

The late Bishop Russell has clarified the many disputes which have arisen around the Charter in his "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary." Of George Calvert he writes: "He admirably illustrated in his life a combination of qualities too rarely found in great men . Having to deal with great political affairs, he was a statesman of the highest order, but at the same time he proved himself to be a man of the most scruplous integrity. Impartial non-Catholic historians have vied with one another in praise of his character." And yet, as another writer points out, no statue, bust or monument on either side of the Atlantic perpetuates the memory of this man, who above all others of his age proved by his words and by his deeds that basic Catholic principle of love for one's fellowmen, without regard to a difference so profoundly antogonistic as religious belief.

Nowhere else in colonial America does the stark tragic

fact of Puritan bigotry stand out so clear as in Maryland. For all time, the Act of Toleration, passed by the Catholics there in 1649 as a last dyke against the religious intolerance seeping into the Province with every welcome held out to Protestant dissenters from other colonies, will remain as America's greatest monument to the Roman Catholic religion.

Article V--Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty.

2. Cecilius and Leonard Calvert.

(Our Sunday Visitor, February 5, 1928)

Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, the actual founder of Maryland, was born about 1606. Little is known of his boyhodd and youth, except that the age of twenty-three he married Anne Arundel, the daughter of one of England's foremost noblemen, the Catholic Earl of Arundel. Like his father, he was a graduate of Oxford. He inherited all his father's sagacity and uprightness of character and showed in his plans for the colonization of Maryland the same prudence and wisdom. The Maryland grant included the territory now constituting the States of Delaware and Maryland, the southern edge of Pennsylvania, and a part of what is now West Virginia. After securing the Charter, Cecilius began to make arrangements for planting a colony on the banks of the Chesapeake. Here again, owing to his careful handling of the preliminary details of the voyage and to the "Instructions" he wrote for the conduct of the colonists while aboard the "Ark" and the "Dove" as well as after their landing, Cecilius Calvert has met with unfair treatment from American historians who accuse him of flexibility in matters of religion and politics and who insinuate that he was indifferent to both. Again, it may be claimed without danger of exaggeration that all the strata of English society interested in American Colonization knew what Cecilius Calvert meant to accomplish--the establishment of a Land of Sanctuary for all persecuted Christians, including those of his own faith.

Opposition to Calvert's Charter

The Charter, when made public in 1632, immediately aroused a storm of opposition from both Anglican and Puritan leaders. Some of these objections arose, it is true, from Catholic leaders as well; but once Calvert's policy of toleration was understood and once it became known that he was being aided by prominent Catholics like the Howards, Arundels and Blounts, as well as by the Jesuits, these objections were dropped. It was not so easy to quell the Protestant opposition to this scheme of refuge for the persecuted Catholics. Indeed, it looks as though what really saved the plan was the friendly influence of a Protestant, Sir Thomas Wentworth, later Earl of Stafford.

It was openly said by those opposed to the Maryland Palatinate that it would deprive Protestants of the opportunity to continue their design of forcing the Catholics to conform to the reformed church. To allow the Catholics to escape would deprive priest-hunters of their living and make the penal code idle legislation. Moreover, to allow Catholics to leave the realm would be an implicit acceptance of the rights of "Papists" to enjoy civic and religious freedom. One popular opposition was that the Catholic colonists of Maryland might call in the Spaniards, who were not far away in the West Indies, to massacre all the Protestants in New England and Virginia. All this certainly proves that the preparations for settling the Catholic colony of Maryland were not projected in the dark; and certainly anyone who reads the sturdy answers of Cecilius Calvert to the objectors can hardly conclude that he was anyting else than a noble representative of his illustrious father.

Jesuits Accompany Colonists

The number of the Maryland pioneers is disputed, but it is generally believed that over three hundred colonists had finally agreed to emigrate to Maryland. Cecilius decided to send his brother Leonard Calvert as the head of the party and as first Governor of Maryland. George Calvert, another brother, accompanied Leonard, and, and with them went two assistants and counsellors, both Catholics--Jeremy Hawley and Thomas Cornwallis. The month of October, 1633, found the group ready to embark. Among the emigrants were two Jesuit priests, Fathers Andrew White and John Altham, and a Jesuit lay-brother, Brother Gervase. The majority of the colonists were Catholics and it would have been quite in keeping with the politics of the day if Cecilius Calvert had instructed the Catholics to play their form of government in such a way to keep the political power always in their own hands. Such would have been the action--such was, in fact, the action--of every group of Protestant settlers landing on our shores.

First Law of Religious Freedom.

But to have instructed the Catholics of his colony to follow this narrow minded Puritan policy was foreign to his liberal and far-seeing mind. This can be seen by anyone who will take the trouble to read his celebrated

"Instructions," issued on November 13, 1633, to Leonard Calvert. In these he orders that everything be done "to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers on shipboard," and that nothing be done to give scandal or offense "to any of the Protestants." The Catholic emigrants were to be warned that they were "to be silent upon all occasions of discourses concerning matters of religion." Moreover, all Catholic services, such as Mass and prayers, were to be performed as privately as possible. Such was the first law of religious freedom enacted for the new colony--the absence of any persecution of Protestants because of their religious belief and respect for their religious feelings. What is more important from our point of view is the fact that while in Maryland religious freedom was only a part of the liberty granted to non-Catholics, since they enjoyed a civic freedom and the franchise as well, in every other English settlement along the Atlantic at this time, the large majority of the settlers were disfranchised in religious grounds.

First Mass in Maryland

On Lady Day, March 25, 1634, the colonists landed at St. Clement's Island and the first Mass was celebrated by Father Andrew White. The scene is best described in his own words:

"On the day of the Annunciation of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, in the year 1634, we celebrated Mass for the first time on the Island. This had never been done before, in this part of the world. After we had completed the sacrifice, we took on our shoulders a great Cross, which we had hewn out of atree, and advancing in order to the appointed place, with the assistance of the Governor and his associates, and the other Catholics, we erected a trophy to Christ the Saviour, humbly reciting, on our bended knees, the litanies of the Holy Cross with great emotion."

Cecilius Calvert, the lord proprietory, never came to Maryland, and, during the first thirteen years of the colony's existence, the burden of its political administration fell upon his brother, Leonard Calvert, to whom, therefore, should be given in an especial degree the praise due the whole glorious experiment. Leonard Calvert found himself from the beginning beset by two dangers: the animosity of the squatter, Claiborne, who had taken possession of Kent Island in the Chesapeake and who was being aided and abetted

by the Puritans of Virginia; and the silent but ever-growing religious animosity of the Protestants who were being welcomed to the colony. There is no need to relate the incidents of the bitter struggle which ensued. It is the most shameful page in the history of American Puritanism.

Calvert Oath of Tolerance.

Cecilius Calvert had left no loophole in his "Instructions" for the government of Maryland for the entrance of religious intolerance in any form. The province was in control of a Catholic majority until 1649, and religious equality was rigidly enforced during that period. With a view to perpetuating this basic principle of his rule, Cecilius Calvert prescribed in 1636, the following oath, to be taken by the Governor:

"I will not, by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, trouble, or molest, or discountenance any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for, or in respect to, religion; I will make no difference of persons in conferring offices, favors or rewards, for, or in respect of, religion, but merely as they shall be found faithful and well deserving, and endued with moral virtues and abilities; my aim shall be public unity;and if any person or offices shall molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, on account of his religion, I will protect the person molested and punish the offender."

In July, 1638, occurred the trial of William Lewis, a Catholic colonist, who attacked two of his Protestant servants whom he found reading an anti-Catholic book. Lewis was arrested, tried, and found guilty of having offended against the fundamental law of the province and was heavily fined. In 1641, another Catholic planted, Thomas Gerard, was fined 500 pounds of tobacco for having interfered with Protestant services, and the sentence was so imposed that the fine itself should go for the maintenance of the first Protestant minister to arrive in the colony. Toleration was the accepted social and religious law of the Maryland Catholics and was scrupulously obeyed as long as the Government of the colony was in Catholic hands.

The change came in 1648. Protestants had multiplied in the colony and that year (Leonard Calvert died June 9, 1647) they forced Cecilius Calvert to appoint a Protestant Governor, William Stone, together with five counsellors,

only two of whom were Catholics. The Governor's oath of office was changed in order that no Catholic would be discriminated against in the selection of public officers for the colony on account of his faith. Evidently, the Catholic freemen of the province realized that they could not long hope to enjoy the same freedom they had given the Protestants during the fifteen years that had passed; and in order to raise a barrier to the presence of religious bigotry in Maryland, the Assembly of 1849 passed the celebrated Toleration Act in order to place upon the statute books of the province a law which would enshrine the practice of this first period of Maryland's history.

The Toleration Act

The Toleration Act is the proudest monument in the history of the Catholic Church in the western world. As a legislative confirmation of an unwritten law, the Act, remains forever as a reminder to those of our generation that all back through the years to 1649, Catholics and the Catholic Church have ever stood for religious equality and that in every decade during these three centuries the pages of our colonial and national history have been blackened by the deeds of that element in Protestantism which apparently has never lost its animosity towards the Catholic faith.

Naturally, everything that might be said against the Act, "The true glory of the Catholics of Maryland," has been said; but the result of impartial testimony has brought out in glorious colors the unique place the Catholic freemen of the Assembly of 1649 shall ever have as the creators of this immortal document. The storm of intolerance was about to break upon them, and in the succeeding decade the old hatred of "Popery" was to rule the province; but if the Maryland experiment went down to defeat before its Puritan assailants, it was with an honor that can never be taken away from the Catholic Church. Six years later (1654), Catholics were outlawed, and from that time until the Revolution, the cry "No Popery", which one Protestant writer has called the absurdest shriek of agony that ever split the air, was the dominant note heard in the halls of justice, in the assembly, and in the pulpits of Protestant churches. Though Cecilius Calvert lived until 1675, he was powerless to aid his fellow-Catholics in the province over which he ruled. Puritan bigotry had won its greatest victory in the New world.

Article VI--Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty.
3. Rober Williams (1599-1683).

(Our Sunday Visitor, February 12, 1928)

Three of the founders of the thirteen English colonies deserve a place apart in the history of religious freedom in America--George Calvert (1580-1632), Roger Williams (1599-1683), and William Penn (1644-1718). All three of these colonial founders had much in common. As Charles Hallan McCarthy writes in his "History of the United States for Catholic Schools," Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, "is to be classed with George and Cecil Calvert, his predecessors in the field of religious freedom, and with William Penn, the Quaker, his worthy successor in the following generation."

All three differed in many ways, but they reached the decision to make religious equality a part of the colonial government they intended to establish upon the same liberal principles. Calvert went beyond Roger Williams and Penn in this--that religious freedom was the actual basis of his government. The credit is all the greater to these three pioneers, since they could not possibly have found in the social and political intolerance in England, or in the colonies already founded, any support for their liberality and humaneness.

Roger Williams Exiled From Massachusetts.

Roger Williams was born in Wales in 1599 during one of the most bloodthirsty decades in the reign of England's cruel and intolerant Queen. We know what a gallant stand the Welsh made all through Elizabeth's reign against the New Religion and how little by little, as Frederick George Lee has written in his "Church under Queen Elizabeth," force gradually triumphed over conscience and the faithful Catholics were driven from church, convent, and monastery at the point of the sword. Whether Williams was the son of Catholic parents is uncertain. He graduated from Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1627, and took orders in the Church of England. Shortly afterwards he became identified with the extreme Puritans and was one of those who sought refuge in the American colonies, owing to the hos-

tility of Laud, then Bishop of London. Williams was a thorough-going dissenter; and when he arrived in Boston, in February, in 1631, he soon incurred the wrath of its religious leaders by denying the competency of the magistrates to interfere in certain matters of conscience. Owing to his gentle disposition and the spirituality of his character, he was invited to take the pulpit in the Salem congregation. From this vantage-ground, he lashed the State-Church of Massachusetts for its intolerance. His radical view of the necessity of a complete separation of Church and State forced him to take refuge with the more liberal-minded Puritans of Plymouth. Here he remained about two years, and in 1635, the General Court of Massachusetts exiled him from the Colony. To those in power the teaching of Williams sounded like anarchy.

Williams Founds Town of Providence.

Roger Williams fled to Rhode Island to escape arrest; and there founded the town of Providence, in 1636. His theology centered around the doctrine that Church and State were to be kept apart and that the civil law had no authority in matters of religious belief, since each individual was free to follow the guidance of his own conscience. The Charter of 1644 of the "Providence Plantation" is silent, however, on the question of religious freedom. The Great Charter of 1663 contained the celebrated clause--"Every person may at all times freely and fully enjoy his own judgment and conscience in matters of religious concernments."

Out of these facts has grown a theory which has been practically accepted by all American historians that Roger Williams founded the first home of religious freedom not only in America but in the world. It is well to repeat some of the statements made by these writers. Hockett, in his "Political and Social History of the United States," claims that Rhode Island was "the first among philosophers and statesmen, since the day of Constantine, to proclaim the complete freedom of mind and conscience from all civil bounds, became the founder of the first state in whose fundamental law that freedom was incorporated, the actual reason and purpose of the state's existence." Beard's "Rise of American Civilization," the latest and probably the best

survey of American history in English, calls Williams "a pioneer among the bold thinkers of the world in proclaiming religious toleration on principle rather than on expedience." All this is high praise. Indeed, were it true, it would place Roger Williams foremost of all Americans who have ever lived.

Three Documents of Toleration.

No one can sincerely doubt Williams' integrity in his policy of complete religious freedom. No one would sincerely wish to deny to him the great glory of actually being the first to teach and to practice such a noble doctrine. That honor rests upon the interpretation of three documents--The Compact of 1636, the Charter of 1644, and the Great Charter of 1663. A careful examination of these three papers has been made by Rev. Lucian Johnston, of Baltimore, in his "Religious Liberty in Maryland and Rhode Island," and the critical analysis given in his pages raises several questions which have not yet been adequately answered by those who claim prior rights for Roger Williams in this regard. It must be remembered that the freedom written into the Compact of 1636 is two years later than the founding of Maryland and nearly ten years after George Calvert had made religious equality the basis for his government of Newfoundland, or Avalon. The absence of Catholics in Rhode Island leaves the issue in doubt, and considerable risk is run by the historian who claims that the Charter of 1663 actually opened the borders of Rhode Island to the Catholics who were proscribed by the laws of other American colonies. It is undeniable that later on, about the year 1728, Catholics were disfranchised by the Rhode Island Assembly, but the historians of the State are agreed that the law was never acted upon. Archbishop Dowling, who is the leading authority on the history of the Church in the New England States, says in his "History of the Diocese of Providence" that no test oath was ever administered in Rhode Island and that no questions were ever asked as to the religion of the candidates for franchise in the colony.

Honor Due Williams.

Without wishing to deprive Roger Williams of the honor and glory which are justly due to one who was so far

advanced in liberality and tolerance beyond the Protestant leaders of the other American colonies, the problem of how far religious liberty was extended to Catholics remains unsettled, owing to the fact that Rhode Island had very few, if any, Catholic colonists whose presence would reduce to practice the theory on which Williams' prestige has been based.

That Rhode Island was not the first colony to practice religious equality needs no proof, since Lord Baltimore's charter of 1632 for Maryland, granting religious freedom, was the logical and historical development of his Avalon. (Newfoundland) patent of 1623. Religious freedom was the law in Maryland a whole year before the banishment of Williams (1635) and for almost thirty years before the Great Charter of Rhode Island of 1663. But as one Catholic writer says, "a Baltimore is, at bottom, somewhat idle as at best it is a priority of only a few years. Both were undoubtedly great and broad-minded men, pioneers in the cause of religious freedom, though not its originators. A broad view will give credit to both for equal liberality and for having worked out the problem in the best way suitable to each, one as a preacher, the other as apractical man of business, both as founders of colonies."

Williams' Liberal-Mindedness Catholic

What is of greater importance is the realization that the great and noble experiment of Roger Williams in creating a haven of religious freedom in the New World would have been utterly impossible had it not been that in his own unexplainable way there was not sufficient Puritanism in the man to carry on the blighting intolerance of those whose ancestors had thrown off the liberalism of Catholic teaching. The best the Protestant pioneer of the land brought with him, it has been said, no matter how unwittingly it was brought, was Catholic. Roger Williams' liberal-minded humaneness was as truly Catholic as the purest spirit of freedom in the Middle Ages, when the world was Catholic. It is a consoling thing, says Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, in his "Obligations to America", and all the more so because it is so undeniably true, that "turn wheresoever you will in these United States and study any ~~commonly~~ institution or any ideal which has commonly been regarded

as an aspect of true Americanism, and you will discover that no matter who is immediately responsible for its erection or formulation, its embryo and antitype are to be found in Catholic theory or practice. This is what I mean by insisting that America is a daughter of the Catholic Church."

No group in the United States can revere more sincerely the great figure of Roger Williams than those who belong to the Catholic Church. Protestant as he was, his heart was nearer the true Faith in his love for his fellowman than any other non-Catholic in the colonies at that time.

Article Vll--Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty.
4. William Penn. (1644-1718)

(Our Sunday Visitor, February 19, 1928)

Similar in several important respects to the Calvert foundation of Maryland was the establishment of the province of Pennsylvania by William Penn in 1681. Penn was at this time in middle life, having been born in London in 1644. The son of Admiral Sir William Penn, he was educated at Christ Church College, Oxford, where he fell under the influence of Thomas Loe and became attracted to the Quaker faith. His life from this time until his death can be divided into three periods: from his conversion until his departure for Pennsylvania in 1682; from that year until his departure from the colony in 1701; and from his return to England (1701) until his death in 1718. This third period of his life has little bearing on the history of religious freedom in America. The second period it is which has given to William Penn an exceptional place as one of the most benevolent and broad-minded men of all time. In Penn's case, the first period must be sharply separated from the second; for, there is little in his writings (and he wrote much during these years) to indicate that when he founded his colony, complete religious freedom would be the rule.

Persecution of the Quakers.

His co-religionists had suffered cruelly at the hands of the English government, in some cases as cruelly as the Catholics, during these years. George Fox, the acknowledged founder of the Quakers, began his preaching in the days of the Commonwealth (1649-1660) and enjoyed to a certain extent the protection of Cromwell; although when the throne was restored to Charles 11, four hundred coherents of the Society of Friends were in prison for their faith. Many of them suffered during Charles' reign (1660-1685) because they would not take the oath of supremacy. During these years, Penn had expelled from Oxfordon account of his refusal to conform to Anglican services and custom, and went abroad for a time to escape punishment. In 1664, he returned to London and began the study of law. Later he was sent to his father's estate near Cork, as manager, and there he became a Quaker.

Owing to his father's prominence at the Court of Charles 11, every effort was made to have him abandon the Society, but he remained firm in his new-found faith and was soon acknowledged as the best controversial writer and preacher among the Quakers. Thrown into prison on several occasions for his utterances, he fought steadily against the Established Church of England. In 1670, his father died and among the parcels of the estate he inherited was a claim of sixteen thousands pounds against the King. After vainly trying to extract the debt fromCharles 11, Penn compromised for the grant of a large tract of land between Maryland and New York of about 45,000 square miles, to which the King gave the name: Pennsylvania. The Charter, granted March 4, 1681, resembled that of Maryland. Penn was to be recognized by the Crown as the true and absolute lord of the domain.

Penn's "Holy Experiment."

He was now free to do what the Calverts had accomplished, in spite of the penal legislation which outlawed the Quakers, namely, to establish a refuge for the persecuted members of his faith. He already owned West Jersey, having purchased that territory in 1674, and upon securing his Charter, he was ready for what he called his "holy experiment." By that term he meant a commonwealth built upon the two principles of democratic government and liberty of conscience. This he declared in the printed advertisements which he issued in English and German, and soon a goodly number of English and German colonists prepared to settle in the newly-established province. The colony flourished from the very outset. Many settlers had already come to the territory and were ready to greet the proprietary, when the "Welcome" with Penn aboard landed near New Castle, Del., in September, 1682. The first colonial assembly of Pennsylvania met at Chester, Pa., in December, 1682, and the "Great Law" passed at its sessions has as its first chapter "On Religion." Therein it is stated that all persons "living in this Province... shall not in any case be molested or prejudiced for his, or her, conscientious persuasion or practice." This meant of worship for the Catholics who should come to the province from abroad or from the neighboring colonies. Under the "Great Law," a Catholic could enjoy not only religious liberty, but the franchise as well. "This exceptional favor," writes Cobb in his "Rise of Religious Liberty," was due to the sentiment of Penn, "who in England in his

arguments and influence had grouped the Romanists with the Quakers, as classes fromwhom civil disabilites should be removed."

Penn's Attitude Towards Catholics.

William Penn had not always thought kindly of Catholics, and it may well be surmised that one of the reasons why his violent distribes against the Catholics so generously scattered through the pages of his many pamphlets in the earlier part of his public career, were silenced, was because he was obliged in 1678, to defend himself before a committee of Parliament fromthe charge of being a concealed Papist, a seminarist, a Jesuit, an emissary of Rome, and in the pay of the Pope, a man dedicating his endeavors to the interest and advancement of that party." He was honest enough to perceive that he could not in justice demand liberty of conscience for his own co-religionists without extending that same liberty to Catholics; but it took some years for that realization to effect a change in his antagonistic attitude towards Catholicism. A bond of suffering, writes Kirlin in his "Catholicity in Philadelphia," united Catholics and Quakers. "Both had felt alike the lash of Persecution; both had been taxed unjustly for the support of a religion that had made itself odious. Although the Friends had felt the force of laws directed primarily against the Papists, and although Penn did not approve of all Catholic practice and certain doctrines that he thought were Catholic, his true charity would not permit him to except Catholics from his liberal laws, as they were excepted in the other colonies.

Early Catholics of Pennsylvania.

There is evidence, indeed, of Catholics living in the province from its earliest settlement. Daniel Nestorious, who led the first German colonists to what is now Germantown, had a Catholic in his party, and the record exists of a J. Gray, a Roman Catholic gentlemen of London, who came to Philadelphia under the name of John Tatham in 1685. It is believed that his profound knowledge of the faith and his staunch adherence to the Church gave to Pennsylvania its first Catholic convert, Lionell Brittin. Before the first decade had passed, the Catholics of Philadelphia and the surrounding villages were being attended by priests fromNew York and Maryland. In fact, it is on

record that Mass was celebrated publicly in Philadelphia as early as 1707.

But the liberal attitude shown towards Catholics by Penn himself did not last long. After his first return to England in 1684, he succeeded in obtaining from James 11 the release of more than 1,200 Quakers fromprison; and when the King issued his Declaration of Indulgence (April, 1687), granting liberty of conscience to all his subjects, the pressure which drove Catholics out of England was removed for a time. This declaration may be taken as the first step in James' downfall the following year. When William and Mary ascended the throne, Penn was in peril for a time owing to his friendship for the last Catholic King of England and was harried by the English government until 1694, when his proprietary rights in Pennsylvania were restored to him and he was free to return to Philadelphia. This second journey occurred in September, 1699. Two years later, he was obliged to return to England to protect his rights, and he never returned, dying on July 30, 1718.

English Test Oath.

Meanwhile, the first Parliament of William and Mary's reign had passed (1689) the Toleration Act granting freedom of worship to all dissenters except Catholics. The test oath to be taken by all public officials was extended to the colonies and this excluded Catholics from the right of franchise. William Penn made a gallant fight against the application of the test oath in his province, but it was passed by the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1696. In 1699-1700, he succeeded in restoring the liberty granted by the "Frame of Government" of 1682, but a peremptory order from William's successor, Queen Anne, in 1702, annulled the law of 1682, and exacted the test oath of every person in public office. This act remained in force until 1776. "Thus," says Cobb, "the Quakers went back on their record as champions for human freedom,and established for their chosen colony the principle which elsewhere they had resisted, that the full enjoyment of civil rights should be confined to professors of a specified religious creed."

During these years (1702-1776), while Catholics were excluded fromparticipating in the political affairs of the

province, to the honor of Pennsylvania it can be said that they enjoyed during this period a larger freedom for the exercise of their faith than in any other colony along the Atlantic coast. Penn failed, as the Calverts had failed, to stem the tide of that intolerant attitude towards the ancient Faith which has always acted on the principle that only Christians of the Protestant churches were fit for public office or citizenship.

Washington Helped Build Catholic Church.

As a result of the religious freedom granted to Catholics in Pennsylvania during this period when civic rights were denied (1702-1776), there was a more compact organization of Catholic life in the Province than in Maryland. St. Joseph's church, in Philadelphia, was erected by Father Joseph Greaton, S.J., who began his labors there in 1720. We have a fuller history of Catholicism in Pennsylvanis from this time to the Revolution than in any other part of the colonies. It was in the Philadelphia that the first church for the Germans was erected, and it is a sign of the important change that had come over the colonial mind when we find President George Washington's name in the list of contributors to the erection of St. Augustine's church in 1796.

Side by side with the Calverts and Roger Williams stands the sturdy, stock figure of William Penn. A fighter like the other pioneers of religious liberty in the colonies, Penn never yielded on the principle of freedom of conscience, and he deserves to be ranked as one of the pioneers of America's greatest heritage--equal justice and liberty to all the inhabitants of the land.

Article Vlll--Colonial Pioneers in Religious Liberty.
5. Thomas Dongan (1634-1715)

(Our Sunday Visitor, February 26, 1928)

Thomas Dongan, the second Earl of Limerick, was born the year of Maryland's found (1634), at Celbridge, County Kildare, Ireland, and was a nephew of Grace Calvert, the daughter of Lord Baltimore, who married his uncle, Sir Robert Dongan. Thoroughly devoted to the Stuarts, the Dongans went into exile after the execution of Charles 1 (1649), and Thomas became a colonel of one of the Irish regiments in France. He returned to England in 1678, and six years later was appointed by James 11 then Duke of York, as Governor of the Province of New York.

Few men who participated in colonial foundations in America have received such universal praise as Governor Dongan. And justly so. For Dongan contributed to American history something more than another page in its annals of religious freedom. He, more than any other statesman of the colonial period, laid the foundations of American liberties. The "Catholic Encyclopedia" attributes to him, as the author of the Charter of Liberties of 1683, the high honor of being the founder of the American Constitution of a century later, because "his system of government became the programme of continuous political agitation by the colonists of New York Province during the eighteenth century. It developed naturally into the present state government, and many of its principles passed into the framework of the Federal Government."

Distortion of History by Omission

The Charter of 1683 is one of the outstanding papers in the development of political science. It enacted a democratic form of government similar to that under which we now live in the United States. Courts of justice were established. Religious liberty was guaranteed, and the shibboleth of Revolutionary days--no taxation without representation--was made the cornerstone of the policy of the Province. Suffrage or the right to vote was denied

The Province was almost without exception peopled by Dutch and English Protestants, all of whom were strong believers in the dangers of "Popery."

The reader interested in the moral and political conditions in New York willfind them described in "Religion in New Netherland," which the Rev. Dr. Frederick J. Zwierlein, of Rochester Seminary, published some years ago. It is a sad picture, and only a man of Dongan's courage would have attempted the administration of the Province. How quickly he won the good will of the leaders in New York cna be seen in the letters sent to the head of the Dutch church at Amsterdam and to James himself. For example, the sheriffs of the Province in an address to the Duke of York wrote: "We do therefore beseech your royal highness to accept our most humble and most hearty thanks for sending us over the honorable Colonel Thomas Dongan, to be lieutenant and governor of this province, of whose integrity, justice, equity and prudence we have already had a very sufficient experience at our last general Court of Assizes."

King James' Instruction to Dongan.

The instructions given by James 11 to Dongan reveal the last of the Stuarts to ascend the throne of England as a statesman far beyond the boasted liberality of the times. For the first--and let us admit it honestly, the last--time, in the history of the colonies up to the middle of the nineteenth century, the people, without distinction of creed, class or property ownership, were given control of their own government. You will look in vain in all colonial American history for the words found in the preamble to the Charter of Liberties--"the people met in general assembly."

Dongan was accompanied in 1683 by Father Thomas Harvey, S.J., as his chaplain. In 1685, Father Henry Harrison,S.J., arrived in New York City, and later Father Charles Gage,S.J., came to the Province. Although the Charter expressly gave toleration to Christians only, it is historically true that the Jews were allowed to erect a synagogue by the large-hearted Governor. Catholics were few in the Province; but evidently there were enough to warrant the opening of a Latin School by the Jesuits. When Charles 11 died in 1685, Dongan's protector, the Duke of York, ascended the throne as James 11 and New York ceased to be a proprietary government and became a royal province. The Board of Trade and Plantations which governed the colonies vetoed the Charter of Liberties and James 11 was forced to accept their de-

to none. In spite of the breath-taking liberality of the Charter, the reader will look in vain for it in such manuals (prepared for our colleges and universities) as that by the eminent historian, William Macdonald, "Select Charters Illustrative of American History." Dongan's name will not be found in the latest and most pretentious of all histories of the United States--that by Charles Beard and his wife. It is silences like these that make the Catholic student of American history pause. It is difficult to pass them bywith the charitable word: oversight. Indeed, the Catholic student must be on his guard at all times against the conscious or unconscious suppression of the truth practiced against his Faith and his Church by Protestant historical writers. It is an unpleasant side of American scholarship, but there can be no doubt of this rather general betrayal of the truth in American historical literature.

Dongan's Famous Charter

Governor Thomas Dongan landed in Boston on August 10, 1683, and was received with due honors by the Governor of Massachusetts. On August 25, he arrived at New York City, the capital of the Province entrusted to his care. On October 17, 1683, he met the seventeen delegates who formed the Assembly, and presented for its consideration the celebrated Charter of Liberties, which the Assembly passed and which Dongan signed on October 30. The religious clause of the Charter was as follows: "No Person or persons which profess faith in God by Jesus Christ shall at any time be anyways molested, punished, disquieted or called in question for any difference in opinion or matter of religious concernment, who do not actually disturb the civil peace of the Province but that all and every person or persons may from time to time and at all times freely have and fully enjoy his or their judgments or consciences in matters of religion throughout all the province, they behaving themselves, peacefully and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others."

The administration of the Province before his coming had become grossly corrupt, and Dongan found no easy task ahead of him in trying to bring order out of the anarchy around him--drunkenness, debauchery, swearing and blasphemy are particularly mentioned in his official instructions from James, Duke of York. His task was evidently difficult when all knew that he was a staunch and zealous Catholic.

cision. In 1687, the King dissolved the New York Assembly, and the following year Dongan was superseded by Sir Edmund Andros, who became Governor of the consolidated Provinces of New England and New York. Dongan then returned to his estate on Staten Island.

Dongan Forced to Flee

With the arrival of William Prince of Orange, who married James' oldest daughter, Mary, in England, on November 5, 1688, the Protestant Rebellion began, and ended that same year in the flight of James 11 to France, William's accession to the throne was the signal for a recreduescence in the colonies of all the vicious penal laws against the Catholics, and under Jacob Leisler a revolution was started in New York for the purpose of exterminating the Catholic citizens of the Province. Dongan was obliged to flee, and in 1691, sailed for England, discouraged in his gallant attempt to stem the ever-rising tide of Protestant intolerance, and impoverished by the very men to who his Charter of Liberties had brought the most ample freedom in existence in any of the American colonies. As a friend of James 11, he and his brother, the Earl of Limerick, were harassed by the English crown, their estates were confiscatd, and their lives in constant danger. In 1698, Dongan succeeded to the earldom of Limerick, but the English sovereigns William and Mary and their successor, Queen Anne, saw to it that he passed the remaining years of his life in abject poverty. He died in 1715 as he had lived, a fervent Catholic and solitary figure in that age of gross bigotry. All that remains to recall his memory to Americans who appreciate his services to constitutional liberty is a bronze tablet which may be seen on St. Peter's Church, in Barclay Street, New York City. In the lbby of the Customs House there is a tablet in memory of Father Harvey, S. J., who celebrated Mass on that spot in 1683.

Magna Charter of American Liberty

Dongan's Charter of Liberties has been justly styled the Magna Charter of American liberty. There is nothing in the colonial history of Puritan New England or in the Anglican Southland comparable to the liberty granted by this Catholic Governor. In spirit and in form Dongan's Charter was superior to all the other colonial systems of government, and certainly in no other colony was the legislature and its powers so thoroughly based upon democratic principles. Although Governor Dongan's term of office

was short, he wrote into the history of political government in America one of its immortal pages. Religious intolerance had kept New York in a constant state of turmoil for nearly forty years before Dongan's arrival. He found the colony on the verge of bankruptcy and rebellion. He made it a haven of peace, a home of justice and refuge, for those persecuted elsewhere for conscience's sake. Eight months after the fanatic Leisler drove him out, the Province was aflame with rebellion. The subsequent history of New York brings out in splendid contrast the liberality of Dongan's scheme of government. It is not surprising that as we come to know him better, we realize that he justly deserves to be called the greatest colonial statesman of the seventeenth century.

Shameful Pages in New York History

How different is the history of religious tolerance after Dongan's departure. The New York Assembly of 1691 declared null and void all the liberal laws of Dongan's rule. The Catholic Church was outlawed and the "Diabolical designs of the wicked and cruel Papists" were again proclaimed asthe chief evil in the Province. In 1700, an act was passed declaring that every priest remaining in or coming into the Province after November 1st of that year, should be condemned to "perpetual imprisonment." In case of escape and capture, he might be treated as an outlaw. The following year Catholics were disfranchased.

There is a shameful page in the story of New York's religious bigotry during the eighteenth century--the hanging of the unfortunate John Ury in 1741, ostensibly because he was alleged to have been an instigator in the Negro Plot, but in reality because he was believed to be a Catholic priest. Whether he was or not, has never been fully determined, although the evidence would lead one to believe he was not. It is, however, quite clear from the printed evidence that the "holy horror of Popery" had as much to do with his execution as the fear of a negro insurrection. Ury was arraigned as a priest, tried and condemned as a priest, and never formally denied his priesthood.

New York mighthave had a glorious share in the his-

tory of high-minded religious liberality, if the Charter of Liberties which Colonel Dongan gave her had been preserved as it was. However, so ingrained was the anti-Catholic spirit that it was only in 1806 that the New York legislature abolished the last of its barriers to Catholic freedom in that state.

Article IX--The Colonial Attitude Towards the Catholic Church 1690-1763

(Our Sunday Visitor, March 4, 1928)

We have seen so far that out of all those whose names and whose fame are inseparably linked with the colonial history of the United States, only six men deserve to be held up to posterity as possessing in their own day of bigotry and narrow-mindedness a humane attitude towards those of other faiths than their own. These men are the Calverts (George, Cecil, and Leonard), Roger Williams, Penn, and Thomas Dongan. Apart fromthese leaders, the entire weight of the colonial mind was deadly so far as liberality of religious thought and action are concerned. Not to understand the colonial anti-Catholic spirit isto bar one's way to the secret springs of many currents in present-day American political thought.

From this anti-Catholic standpoint, the colonial history of the United States may be divided into two distinct parts: first, from the founding of all the colonies (except Georgia) to the year 1689; and secondly, from that date to the outbreak of the American Revolution. Whatever attempts had been made before 1689 to bring a more humane spirit of religious relief into the New World were stilled when the Glorious Revolution became a recognized fact and England's last Catholic King, James 11, was in exile in France.

Passage of English "Toleration" Act

It is doubtful whether any date in American history, even including the year of the Declaration of Independence, is more significant that that of 1689. That year marks the accession to the throne of William 111, "the idol of seventeenth century Protestantism," and Mary, his Queen, the Protestant daughter of James 11. It was England's third revolution in forty years and the new sovereigns realized that peace must be secured at any cost in order to hold their joint throne. Above all was religious peace nessary. To secure this, the

Toleration Act was passed in 1689, granting to all dissenters, that is to every form of Protestant worship, the legal right at home and in the American colonies to public worship upon the acceptance of the oath of allegiance to the crown. By this Act the chief cause of religious strife at home and abroad was removed.

Debarred without exception from the benefit of the Act were all Roman Catholics. Moreover, the Act itself, while bringing relief to many Protestant objectors to the Established Church, enabled all Protestants--Anglicans and Nonconformi~~i~~sts--to make common cause against the Catholics of the realm. To hold any office or public trust under the English government the following test oath had to be taken:

"I do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the See of Rome may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, within this real. So help me God."

With the Toleration Act as a bludgeon the way was now open for the Final extermination of Catholicism in England and in her colonies. The reorganization of the American colonies carried with it certain political changes, the chief of which were a more direct royal power over the colonial Assemblies and the maintenance of a more effective royal control by means of officials sent by the King. Out of this recast of colonial politics was to come eventually the self-determination which ended in independence.

But there was something more. The attempts made by the only liberal-minded statesmen the colonies saw--the Calverts, Williams, Penn, and Dongan--to establish freedom of conscience for all the inhabitants of the land were at an end. Religious coercion was henceforth the law in all the colonies, and with the exception of a small minority of Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania who succeeded in escaping persecution on account of their social and financial

position or on account of the quietness of their lives, one law ruled the American colonies--No "Papists" would be allowed civic or religious rights of any kind and every means would be permitted to the provincial legislatures to outlaw their presence.

"No Popery," Protestant Rallying Cry

From 1689 until the outbreak of the American revolution, the rallying cry of colonial Protestantism was "No Popery." In 1690, the number of Americans was about 220,000. They were living mostly in a narrow strip of land along the Atlantic from Maine to the Carolinas. On the eve of the American Revolution (1760)the total population had increased to 1,500,000. During these years (1689-1763), the American colonies were into the maelstrom of European rivalries and wars; and while the question at stake was international control, religious causes were prominent in the four intercolonial wars--King Williams War (1689-1697) Queen's Ann War (1702-1713), King George's War (1744-1748), and the French and Indian War (1754-1763).

In the first three of these conflicts England was at war with Catholic nations, France and Spain. The proximity of the French in Canada and Louisiana was used by colonial legislatures to offset any alliance between the scattered Catholics, and some curious, if not amusing, laws were passed to keep them from helping their French and Indian coreligionists.

Penal Legislation Against Catholics

The first result of the reconstruction of colonial government under William and Mary (1689-1702) and Anne (1702-1714) was the re-enactment of the penal legislation against Catholics. Effectively confined to the localities in England in which they were living, they could not emigrate freely to the colonies, and those who came found the same restrictions here. The test oath debarred them from all civic office. Priests were not prmitted in the colonies and if they succeeded in entering the provinces they were expelled. A second entry in some cases meant imprisonment and death. One of the most curious pieces of legislation is the action of the General Court of Massachusetts, about ten years before the accession of William and Mary, in making the observance of Christmas a punishable offence, because it savored of "Popery." The legal enactments against

Catholics after 1689 were all the more strongly worded because Protestants in England and in the colonies had not yet recovered from their horror of the proclamation of 1687, in which James 11 gave freedom to Catholics.

Where the colonial legislation shows no enactments against Catholics between 1689 and 1754, it is because therewere no Catholics in that particular province and therefore no cause for alarm over their presence. The Stuart uprising in 1715 and the Highland Rebellion of 1754 found echoes in the colonies and careful watch was placed upon all known Catholics for fear of possible Jacobite sympathies. When Charles, the third Lord Baltimore, died in England in 1715, his son, the fourth Maryland Palatine, found no other way open to secure possession of his province except formal aostasy, and this he agreed to that same year. "A degenerate scion of a noble Roman Catholic house," Cobb calls him. Since the largest number of Catholics (and few they were when totalled up) in the colonies was in Maryland, the Maryland Assembly, therefore, presents the anti-Catholic colonial mind clearer than those of the other provinces, where either playing crude politics or fighting imaginary shadows in their succession of "Acts to prevent the growth of Popery."

Acts Against Catholics

Maryland passed such an Act in 1704, in order to outlaw the presence of any priest or bishop in the province. The only freedom allowed to the Catholics was that of having religious services within the home of a "private family of the Romish communion." In 1715, it was enacted that children of a Protestant father and Catholic mother, in case the father died, could be taken legally from the mother and brought up by Protestant relations. An Act of 1718 forbade Catholics to vote at the polls unless they adjured their faith. The peak of all this irksome penal legislation came in 1756 when a law was passed "for disarming Papists." All Catholics were required to give up whatever arms and ammunition they possessed because "Papists" were considered potential enemies during the French and Indian War. A similar law was passed in Pennsylvania and Virginia.

There can be no surprise, therefore, that Catholics did not come in large numbers to the American colonies during these Protestant years (1689-1763). The surprise is that in spite of so much penal legislation, American Catholics were able to keep the Faith. Classed as unfit to take part in the

political affairs of the colonies, they were thereby placed in the same civic scale with the Negro slaves. "Of all the religious legislation in the colonies," writes Cobb, "nothing was more absurd than that against Roman Catholics. One would suppose that the Roman Church was a constant and threatening foe to colonial institutions. The fact was far otherwise."

Cobb's Comments on Injustice to Catholics.

When the Revolution occurred, there were not more than fifteen thousand Catholics in all the American colonies. Bishop Carroll estimated the total number of Catholics in 1784 as about twenty-five thousand. And standing out like a baleful fire in the midst of Protestant intolerance towards those of the ancient church is the monstrous ingratitude of the Protestants of Maryland. Cobb, in his "Rise of Religious Liberty in America," brushes all this anti-Catholic legislation aside with a condescending gesture. To his mind, and his volume shows how carefully he holds to the principle that Catholicism can only exist in a "Protestant" land, like America, by the large-minded sufferance of those who are opposed to the Catholic Faith, the colonial penal legislation was chiefly sound and fury. Refusing to recognize the deadening effect socially and morally of the weight of these penal laws, he says that the Roman Catholics "suffered no great hardships and no personal persecutions." It is interesting to note that he passes over in silence the case of Rev. John Ury, who was hanged in New York in 1741, because the jury believed he was a Catholic priest.

It only clouds the issue when it is said that "with all the loud professions of Protestant zeal on the part of the leaders, there was too much love of liberty in the land to countenance severity." Against this statement stands the fact that the oppressive anti-Catholic laws were never repealed by the colonial legislatures. The next ten years (1763-1774) were to witness an anti-Catholic agitation in the colonies that was the logical result of a century of Protestant bigotry.

quet, published some years ago in the London "Tablet" several articles under the title--"The price of Catholic Freedom in Canada." Gasquet holds that England by keeping her word with France lost the American colonies. The leading American historian of the Revolution, Van Tyne, holds that the well-known economic causes given in our text-books for the Revolution are not sufficient to explain the bitterness of the struggle, and he rates as principal causes religious bigotry, sectarian antipathy, and the influence of the Calvinistic clergy.

The words of Gasquet merit repetition: "The American Revolution was not a movement for civil and religious liberty; its principal cause was the bigoted rage of the American Puritan and Presbyterian ministers at the concession of full religious liberty and equality to Catholics of French Canada. The Taxation Acts were only a minor cause, or rather occasion, and the dispute could have been settled by Constitutional agitation without secession but for Puritan firebrands and the bigotry of the people."

The Shadow of the Past.

The national inclination of all Americans regardless of creedal differences is to forget these unhappy years of colonial anti-Catholicism. Indeed, many Catholics are opposed to recalling incidents which describe the privations and sufferings endured by their devoted forebears during that long eighteenth century of proscription. But there is no surer or more direct way to know America than to make one's self familiar with the evolution of religious equality up from these darkened years before the Revolution to the full light of American's Constitutional guarantees. The shadow of the past is still upon the land and the intolerance of that past cannot with safety be ignored by those whose hearts are concerned about American's future. When millions of our fellow-citizens believe that the two terms--Americanism and Protestantism--are interchangeable and equal, then we cannot refuse to learn the lessons to be gained from a recapitulation of the wrongs inflicted on Catholics in the name of Protestantism in this land. Men do not gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles.

Canada, had thereby become a traitor to the coronation oath and was secretly a "Papist." Even so enlightened a statesman as Alexander Hamilton said that if Parliament had been "friends to the Protestant cause, they would never have provided such a nursery for its great enemy. They would never have given such encouragement to Popery. They may as well establish Popery in New York and the other colonies as they did in Canada. Your lives, your property, your religion, are all at stake."

On September 6, 1774, the famous Suffolk County Resolutions were passed, and the tenth of these urged the Americans "to take all possible measures" for their security against this new freedom granted to the Catholics of Canada. The day previous, the First Continental Congress met at Philadelphia, with representatives of twelve of the colonies present. The "Declarations and Resolves", passed on October 14, 1774, contained a resolution against freedom of conscience being granted to the Canadains. On October 21, Congress sent an Address to the People of Great Britain, protesting against the action of the British Parliament in establishing in Canada "a religion that has deluged your island in blood, and disbursed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through every part of the world." On October 26, a Petition to King George 111 was passed with a similar protest in stronger language.

Strange Conduct of Congress.

These two state papers we can understand. They are symptomatic of the frenzied fear which the "Popery" bogey always creates in the Puritan mind. But what is difficult to characterize is a letter sent that same day (October 26) by Congress to the Canadains, urging them to join the Americans in the war for independence which they saw was inevitable. In this letter Congress says: "We are too well acquainted with the liberality of sentiment distinguishing your nation to imagine that difference of religion will prejudice you against a hearty amity with us." Intolerance, the Congressional Committee wrote, was a low-minded infirmity.

Few among the better-known writers in the field of American history touch the religious issue of the War of Independence. The noted English historian, Cardinal Gas-

No effort has been left undone to paint these horrible scenes in a light favorable to the Americans and English who were responsible, but nothing can blot out the fact that it was beause the Acadaisn were "Popish Recusants," that they were made to suffere untold tortures. The newspapers of the day contain formal protests against the presence of these "Papists" in the provinces. It was stark tragedy, born of anti-Catholic hate, but it did not prevent Governor Morris of Pennsylvania from calling these wretched exiles "Scorpions in the bowels of the country." Within the next four years, Louisburg and Quebec fell and Canada was at last, after a century of wars in all of which this purpose was a salient factor, an English possession.

When Peace came formally in 1763, the Treaty of Paris contained the following clause: "His Brittanic Majesty, on his side, agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada: he will consequently give the most precise and most effectual orders, that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion, according to the rites of the Romish church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit." On October 7, 1763, a royal proclamation was issued defining the boundaries of the newly acquired territories. The English colonies in North American were divided into four sections: Quebec, the southern boundary of which became the northern limit of New York and New England; East Florida; West Florida; and the Indian Country, that is, all that territory lying west of the Appalachian Mountains to the borders of the Mississippi.

Frenzied Agitation Against Catholics.

We do not need to review the debates which followed when the religious freedom of the Treaty of Paris of 1763 came before Parliament. The Quebec Act, as it is called, finally became a law in 1774. These eleven years saw an anti-Catholic agitation in the American colonies which rose almost to a frenzy. "No Popery" became the watchword, and in thousands of sermons from Protestant pulpits, the titles of which may be seen in Evans' "Chronological Dictionary of Pamphlets," the "drum ecclesiastic" was beaten as never before in England or America. The popular viewpoint was that King George 111, by assenting to the Quebec Act, that is, by granting freedom of worship to the Catholics in the conquered territory of

Article X-Religious Liberty on Eve of the American Revolution. (1763-1774)

(Our Sunday Visitor, March 11, 1928)

It might be held that the highest level of Protestant colonial intolerance apparently had been reached during the French and Indian War (1754-1763) with the "Act for disarming the Papists," were it not for the fact that the following year (1755) witnessed a cruelty unparalleled in the history of any Christian country. This was the dispersion of the Acadian Catholics from Nova Scotia. The principal actor in this disgraceful scene was General John Winslow of Plymouth, Mass.

For a century before Nova Scotia was ceded to Great Britian (1713), these pious and industrious French colonists had built for themselves and their descendants quiet, peaceful villages. They were attached to France and were loyal children of the Catholic Church. After 1713, they accepted English rule and held aloof from all the French and Indian forays along the New England border. Hence they were known as "French Neutrals." They had no part in the French and Indian War, but their lovely valleys and expansive bays were the object of envy to the New Englanders who began to flock there in great numbers after 1713. Ordered to take the oath of allegiance to Great Britain--an oath which implicitly meant the denial of their Faith--they refused.

Outrageous Treatment of Acadians.

There is little use in retelling the story of duplicity and of disgraceful trickery practised by the Americans in robbing the Catholic Acadians of their land. Winslow's act of September 5, 1755, in driving 2,000 of these poor people at the point of the bayonet aboard British vessels has covered his name with an infamy which has never been lightened. Husbands were separated from their wives and children. Children never saw their parents again. The ships that carried them to the American colonies left groups at many a port and the little bands soon found that they were in the midst of a hostile folk whose hatred for their Faith and their race dried up the springs of charity. Almost alone, the Quakers of Philadelphia, theCatholics of Maryland, and the Huguenots of South Carolina treated them with kindness.

elements of our people voice in more ways than one the belief of de Tocqueville that "the Catholics of the United States are at the same time the most faithful believers and the most zealous citizens."

That heritage has been won for us by the devotion and piety of our Catholic ancestors in this country, and it is our duty, not only as loyal children of the Church, but more especially as loyal Americans, to keep the spirit of our Catholicism pure and undefiled from the irreligious and consequently undemocratic spirit of the sects around us. Catholicism in its dogmatic and in its moral teaching is the surest bulwark America possesses against the disintegration of the nation's ideals and against the collapse of America's prestige in the world as humanity's kindliest and tenderest mother--the home of equality, of liberty and of fraternal charity.

Democracy's Debt to Church.

A striking thing it is, to notice with what complacency in volume after volume on American political ideals, the false principle is enunciated that democracy is the "creative expression" of Protestantism. Themost recent descant on this threadworn record is that a nation needs but to apply democracy to its system of government and immediately "all the fruits of the Reformation will be realized, even in a Catholic community." Nothing could be farther from the truth; nothing more misleading to the impartial mind seeking for the real origins of democratic government. American Catholics are not blameless in the face of the persistency of this falsehood, for it is due in large measure to their lack of interest in the Catholic origins of democracy that those outside the Church are not halted in the thoroughly hackneyed and untenable theory of an essential identity between Protestantism and democratic equality. A single reading of the volume "The State and the Church" by Fathers John A. Ryan and Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S.J., will reveal to all who are sincerely interested in this fundamental question of American history the extent of all that the United States owes to the Catholic Faith.

been freely left open, to the researches of political inquiry. Thus the Catholics of the United States are at the same time the most faithful believers and the most zealous citizens."

This is a tribute to the Catholic faith which should encourage every heart that loves America. Catholicism -- with its doctrines, its religious life, its profound idea of authority, its attitude of reverence towards those who exercise that authority, and with its spirit of obedience to the laws of the land; Catholicsm--with its heroic American past, with Columbus and Las Casas, Champlain, La Salle, and Marquette, Calvert, England, Hughes and Gibbons, and its long honor roll of great names who have given of their best for the foundation and the preservation of America; Catholicism--with its unbounded response at all times, both in peace and in war, when the country calls upon its citizens for aid; Catholicism, in fine, with its unbroken and unbreakable doctrine of allegiance to the law of the land, has been American's one constant and faithful element down the aisle of the years that have elapsed since Freedom's day in 1776.

Washington's Hope Not Yet Fulfilled.

Washington told us a century ago that he hoped our fellow citizens would never forget the patriotic part men and women of our faith took in the accomplishment of the Revolution and in the establishment of our government or the important assistance which was received "from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed." There are many within the fold of the Church who feel that Washington's hopes have never been generously fulfilled.

They see the blackened ruins of convents and churches burnt by fanatic anti-Catholic mobs; they see newspapers filled with diatribes and lies against the Faith, going to millions of homes in the United States; they realize that a process of anti-Catholic selection is always at work in the professions and inpublic places of trust; current anti-Catholic campaigning which shames so many of our State and Federal elections, but in spite ofall this, in spite of the inevitable conclusion that many of those outside the Faith in America have not yet reached the height of the American ideal of religious equality and freedom, Catholics must always remember that the better

class of citizens which exists in the United States; and although this fact may surprise the observer at first, the cause by which it is occasioned may easily be discovered upon reflection."

Catholicism Favorable to Democracy.

It is now almost a century since de Tocqueville visited the United States, and his tribute to the Catholicism of that day is indeed one worthy of being cherished always; but the illustrious author saw even more profoundly into the place Catholicism was to hold in the land, if democracy was to endure. "I think," he writes, "that the Catholic religion has erroneously been looked upon as the natural enemy of democracy. Among the various sects of Christians, Catholicism seems to me, on the contrary, to be one of those which are most favorable to the equality of conditions. In the Catholic Church, the religious community is composed of only two elements: the priest and the people. The priest alone rises above the rank of his flock, and all below him are equal. On doctrinal points the Catholic faith places all human capacities upon the same level; it subjects the wise and ignorant, the man of genius and the vulgar crowd, to the details of the same creed; it imposes the same observances upon the rich and the needy; it inflicts the same austerities upon the strong and the weak; it listens to no compromises with mortal man, but reducing all the human race to the same standard, it confounds all the distinctions of society at the foot of the same altar, even as they are confounded in the sight of God. If Catholicism predisposes the faithful to obedience, it certainly does not prepare them for inequality; but the contrary may be said of Protestantism, which generally tends to make men independent, morethan to render equal....No sooner is the priesthood entirely separated from the Government, as is the case in the United States, than it is found that no class of men are more naturally disposed than the Catholics to tranfuse the doctrine of the equality of conditions into the political world...The Catholic clergy of the United States has never attempted to oppose this political tendency: but it seeks rather to justify its results.

"The priests in America have divided the intellectual world into two parts; in the one they place the doctrines of revealed religions, which command their assent; in the other they leave those truths, which they believe to have

American Democracy's Basic Elements

That new science de Tocqueville saw in the spirit behind the successful organization of the American Republic, and his volume "Democracy in America" was, and is still , the text-book for the nations of the world. What were the essential elements of that spirit, what were the principles of democracy, what were the granite rocks, as Lacordaire said, upon which the truest democracy might be built? The answer to these questions de Tocqueville saw in an analysis of the American spirit. That analysis gave four basic elements:

1. The American spirit is religious.
2. It has innate respect for law and order.
3. It cherishes liberty as intensely as it cherishes equality.
4. It places the foundation of political liberty in civil liberty.

In placing religion first in this category, de Tocqueville was influenced not only by his own belief in the necessity of a religious basis to all political institutions, but also by the powerful factor religion had been in the foundation and conservation of the American Republic. It was this affinity between religion and politics which became consecrate atthe time the American Colonies were founded, and which has been the safeguard of American democracy ever since. De Tocqueville says: "The greatest part of British America was peopled by men who, after having shaken off the authority of the Pope, acknowledged no other religious supremacy: they brought with them into the New World a form of Christianity which I cannot better describe, than by styling it a democratic and republican religion. This contributed powerfully to the establishment of a democracy and a republic; and from the earliest settlement of the emigrants, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved. Almost fifty years ago, Ireland began to pour a Catholic population into the United States; on the other hand, the Catholics of America made proselytes, and at the present moment more than a million of Christians, professing the truths of the Church of Rome, are to be met within the Union. These Catholics are faithful to the observances of their religion; they are fervent and zealous in the supportand belief of their doctrines. Nevertheless they constitute the most republican and the most democratic

visited, whether in England, Russia, China, or Japan, he came face to face with a situation, he knew already--that of peoples governed by rulers. For the first time he saw a flourishing nation, peaceful, industrious, rich, power, respected abroad, spreading day by day into vast solitudes the tranquil stream of its population, and nevertheless having no master but itself, submitting to no distinction of birth, electing its own magistrates of every degree of the civil and political hierarchy, free as the Indians who preceded them, as civilized as the best peoples of Europe, religious without giving to any sect exclusive or preponderating rights, and presenting to an admiring world the living drama of the most absolute liberty in an equality the most entire."

Few descriptions of contemporary American institutions contain so many vital truths as this. De Tocqueville's admiration for America was not, however, without its restrictions. He did not believe that the political and religious systems which we had achieved were equally applicable to all peoples. In the very midst of his eloquent praise of America he feared not to lash the horrors of slavery which were then quite apparent in the land.

But when he compared our institutions with those in Europe and visualized the future of humanity, he saw the United States as the leader of that world democracy which has written its latest chapter on the bloodiest battlefields of all time. The future always held, as he said, a sort of religious terror for him, and the only hope he saw was in the fact that the democracy which governed American communities appeared to be rapidly rising into power in Europe. In one of the strongest paragraphs of his volume he writes: "The first duty which is at this time imposed upon those who direct our affairs is to educate our democracy; to warm its faith, if that be possible, to purify its morals; to direct its energies; to substitute a knowledge of business for its inexperience, and an acquaintance with its true interests for its blind propensities; to adapt its government to time and place, and to modify it in compliance with the circumstances and the actors of the age. A new science of politics is indispensable to a world entirely new."

Article Xl--Catholicism and Democracy

(Our Sunday Visitor, March 18, 1928)

More than three score years have passed since the white-robed figure of one of the greatest of modern Dominicans, Henry Dominic Lacordaire, arose in the French Academy to deliver his inaugural address before that body of Immortals. It was customary then, as it is now, for each newly-elected member to extol the virtues of his dead predecessor; and seldom had anyone a panegyrist of such supreme skill as de Tocqueville had in Lacordaire, the foremost pulpit orator of the nineteenth century.

Charles-Alexis de Tocqueville, the eminent political writer and statesman, died in 1859, at the early age of fifty-four, after having won undying fame by his great classic "Democracy in America," which he published in 1840. In January, 1861, Lacordaire, then at the height of his powers and within the shadow of his untimely death, was elected as his successor in the French Academy.

The American Civil War was then visible on the political horizon and it is not surprising that the burden of Lacordaire's famous discourse should be about America. No man of his times foresaw with more striking accurateness of vision the future greatness of the Catholic Church in the United States and the inevitable disintegration of Protestantism there, than de Tocqueville. His profound appreciation of the political institutions of our country was universally regarded in his own day as the clearest and most impartical judgment ever made upon the American Republic.

New Experience For De Tocqueville.

"It was impossible for de Tocqueville to touch the soil of America," Lacordaire said, "without being astonished by this new world, so different from that where he was born. Everywhere else in the old world, where he

Article XII--The Catholic Background to the Declaration of Independence.

(Our Sunday Visitor, March 25, 1928)

Of all the challenges that may be given to those who fail to understand the Catholic Question in the United States, none can be made with such security as this: Catholic doctrine and practice alone possess the real origin of those political principles which are enunciated in the immortal Declaration that placed the United States among the free and independent nations of the world.

It is customary to view the Declaration of Independence as the logical culmination of a long train of abuses and usurpations on the part of a despotic home government which could not or would not understand colonial America. We have not made sufficient advance in the education of our citizens to expect that the colonial and revolutionary backgrounds to American independence are being adequately grasped today. Patriotic tradition and popular misinterpretation of the facts involved in our freedom prevent to a great extent the spread of a more accurate knowledge of these supreme facts in the nation's history.

For that reason, not to stress many others, it will only be those whose acquaintance with our history has advanced beyond the elementary stage, who will be interested in recognizing the abrupt cleavage made by the Founders of the American Republic in framing the Declaration of 1776 from the many acts and statutes passed by our colonial legislatures for the political and religious discrimination of their fellow-colonists of other faiths and creeds.

The Declaration of Independence has been described by Dr. William MacDonald, in his "Three Centuries of American Democracy," as a document combining with rare skill and effectiveness a theory of government and a statement of grievances--"the theory of a free state, governed on a divine order of human equality, subsisting under forms of government sanctioned by the consent of the governed, op-

erating for the maintenance of human rights and subject to change through revolution when the government ceased to serve the ends for which it had been created." The political philosophy which gave birth to this new theory of government is accredited by Dr. MacDonald to the writings of Rousseau and to the essential foundations of English political theory and practices.

Neither of these two propositions stands up under an impartial scrutiny.

Declaration An Abrupt Change of Policy.

In fact, nothing so clearly emphasizes their inherent falsity as the abrupt change from the English colonial narrowness of political vision as the central principles of the Declaration itself. These are the doctrine of human equality and the doctrine of the right of government as derived from the consent of the governed.

No two pronouncements broke so thoroughly with the colonial past as these. A careful survey of the colonial charters and other organic laws of the period prior to 1776 in Thrope's great collection of seven volumes will reveal how closely intertwined were property and religious qualifications as legal restrictions on liberty.

A list of the test oaths promulgated in the colonies, and later in many of the State Constitutions from 1776 to 1844, will show how far removed Puritan and Anglican America was from any "divine order of human equality." A careful study of the long struggle that followed the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1787-1788, on the part of those free Americans who carried over into the new Republic the political and religious ostracism of colonial days, will prove to the hesitant student that the Declaration of Independence was at the time it was passed an astounding attempt to make America safe for democracy. In fact the twelve years of anarchy in our State and Federal governments between 1776 and 1787--the least known of all the chapters in American history--can rightly be interpreted by those seeking the actual conditions which then prevailed, as giving the lie to these two basic principles of the Declaration itself.

The two principles which constitute the very cornerstone of the American Republic were copied into the pre-

amble of the Declaration of Independence from the preamble of the Declaration of the Bill of Rights adopted by the Virginia convention on June 12, 1775. The preamble of the Virginia Declaration was written by Jefferson. It declared that all men are by nature equally free and are invested by nature with certain inalienable rights, among which are "the Enjoyment of Life and Liberty, with the means of accruing and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining Happiness and Safety," that "Power is, by God and nature, vested in, and consequently derived from the People," and that "government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common Benefit and Security of the People, nation, or Community."

This preamble, as rewritten the following year by Jefferson, is found inthe Declaration of Independence in practically the same phrases: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The problem of the historian is to ascertain with scrupulous exactitude the source when Thomas Jefferson drew his knowledge of these self-evident truths.

The commonest (because the easiest) method of answering this question will be seen in most of the popular manuals of American history in use today ; namely, that the preamble of the Declaration came from the preamble to George Mason's Virginie Bill of Rights, and that this latter came from the English Bill of Rights of 1689. Evidently the authors of these manuals never compared the two documents; for, the alleged English prototype of 1689 contains in none of its parts these two foundation stones of American democracy. It is historically dishonest to make the claim that the Bill of Rights of 1689 is the model for the Declaration of Independence.

Tracing Origin of Declaration's Principles.

One of the first Catholic Scholars who successfully traced the origin of the preamble to the Virginia Bill of

Rights and Declaration ofIndependence through Algernon Sidney, who was executed in 1683 for his democratic teachings, and John Locke, whose "Two Treatises on Government" appeared in 1689, to Suarez, Bellarmine, and Persons, and to the Catholic political philosophers of the middle ages, was the late Gaillard Hunt in an article he contributed shortly before his death (1921) to the "Catholic Historical Review." In 1924, Dr. John A. Ryan and Father Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S. J., thoroughly analyzed the question in their volume: "The State and the Church." Another writer to deal with this question in a popular way is Sylvest McNamara, in his "American Democracy and Catholic Doctrine."

With the exception of a short essay by Dr. David Schaff of the Union Theological Seminary, read before the American Society of Church History in 1927, and entitled: "The Bellarmine-Jefferson Legend and the Declaration of Independence," Protestant, or, to be more precise, Calvinist, scholars have generally ignored the challenge in this question.

And, it has been wiser to ignore it. For, there is a road without an egress before those who attempt in our late day to plead further the tradition that American freedom was born of Protestantism. Treacherous indeed are the pitfalls for the student of political theory and government who would endeavor to trace to Protestant Political writers the democratic ideals of the United States.

Effect Of Reformation On Democracy.

Democracy was all but annihilated by the so-called Reformation. Protestantism meant, for all practical purposes, the destruction of the right to life, property and personal freedom; it meant the abolition of freedom of conscience, of speech, of the press. Its most appalling consequence was the decay of education and the outlawing of charity. As McNamara has written: "It added nothing new to the sum of existing democratic thought; but, on thecontrary, popularized dogmas productive of absolute and arbitrary government in teaching the union of Church and State and the divine right of kings--two of the most pernicious doctrines ever conceived in the mind of men to destroy the political freedom of a people. Its dogma of private interpretation has been the actuating principle and justification of every religious fanatic and political anarchist who saw in himself an inspired prophet of God or the saviour of a people frompolitical bondage. Its teaching of passive obed-

ience and denial of the right of legitimate rebellion against political tyranny, while illogical in view of its dogma of private interpretation, was the direct cause of the civil and industrial oppression and exploitation of the masses. History records no greater political servility than that fostered and established by the so-called Protestant Reformation."

Apparently, there are two lines of descent through the political philosophers of the past to the minds of Mason and Jefferson and all the Americans of their day who believed as they did on the question of inalienable rights and representative government.

One of these lines is as old as the Catholic Faith and can be traced fromthe writings of the Fathers to the Scholastics and from their day on to the great Jesuit leaders of political thought--Father Robert Persons, S.J., Blessed Robert Bellarmine, S.J., and Father Francis Suarez, S.J., The other line of descent begins with Hooker, who wrote his "Ecclesiastical Polity" in 1594, and can be traced through Prynne and Rutherford to Algernon Sidney, and to John Locke, whose "Two Treatises" were published in 1689. Sidney and Locke were the most popular political writers among the Americans of the eighteenth century, and no American knew their words better than Jefferson.

American's Debt to Catholicism.

The truth is that there are not two lines of descent. There is but one, and that is Catholic. Hooker gave his readers nothing more than he had found in Catholic writers who antedated his "Ecclesiastical Polity." Prynne, who published his "Sovereign Power of Parliament" in 1643, admits that it is to Catholic writers he was obliged to go to find true democratic principles, and he was accused as a result of "plain and palpable Popery."

No one ever seriously claimed profound originality of thought for Sidney and Locke. Both copied largely from medieval Catholic writers and both depend upon Bellarmine for their exposition of democratic government and the natural rights of man.

It would take us too far afield here to enter into a detailed discussion on these points. Indeed, with McNamara's little treatise at hand it is not necessary. All that need be stressed for the surety of the continuance of American idealism, is that Catholics should enter more profoundly into the

study of our political origins in order to realize that the preamble of the Declaration of Independence is a Catholic heirloom which fortunately escaped the deadening blight of that absolutism in government which is essential to all Protestant governments.

Let it be clearly understood, however, that this challenge to impartial American historical scholarship is made not primarily for the purpose of refuting the unjust claim that modern civil liberty is the result of doctrines of political Protestantism. Such a challenge ought to have but one immediate effect--a determined effort on the part of every Catholic layman to gain a fuller understanding of the great debt American democracy owes to Catholicism.

Had the Catholic Church not been the constant source of Christian democracy, had she not fostered it in a hundred ways especially during the thousand years she was supreme mistress of religious thought, and had her great scholars, of whom Bellarmine is foremost, not fought for the preservation of the democratic ideal of government, civil and religious liberty as enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States would never have been given voice and authority in the birth of our nation.

Article X111--Catholic Participation in the Revolution. (1775-1783)

(Our Sunday Visitor, April 1, 1928)

High up among the so-called causes of the American Revolution must be placed the Puritan opposition of New England to the Quebec Act of 1774, granting religious freedom to the French Catholics of Canada. All the contemporary newsprints and pamphlet publications are so crowded with invective over the Quebec Act that Catholic writers are within the strictest rules of historical criticism in emphasizing the predominant anti-Catholic sentiment of the decade which preceded American independence.

"No Popery" reigned then as seldom before in the land of future religious liberty. That such animosity existed is not surprising, for it was the logical result of a hundred and seventy years of abuse and misrepresentation. But what will always remain a question of great moment in American history is the astounding fact that after all these years--over acentury and a half--of bitter opposition to their presence and to their religion in the colonies, the Catholics leaped into the breach with their non-Catholic fellow-colonists, once the tocsin sounded for independence.

Surely one might rightfully conclude that the dead weight of Puritan prejudice in the colonies when placed in contrast with England's determination, as seen in the Quebec Bill, to do justice at last to the down-trodden Catholics, would have produced one leading Catholic Tory, one outstanding Catholic Loyalist, at the time of Revolution. But there was no Benedict Arnold, no Charles Lee, in the Catholic ranks.

Foreign Catholic governments were too well-informed by their agents here not to be fully cognizant of the religious background to the Revolution; and yet, they, too, came to the aid of the struggling Americans at the darkest hour of the struggle. All the facts concerning Catholic participation in the War need not be listed; for, while

they remain up to the present time the glorious heritage of every Catholic American in the land and are his highest incentive to a noble patriotic love for his country, these facts are less interesting from the standpoint of the Catholic Question in America than that outstanding phase of the Revolution--the gradual recognition by the Revolutionary leaders, the Assemblies, and by a part of the people, of the right of Catholics to complete civic and religious freedom.

Father Carroll's Patriotism.

It was natural for the First Continental Congress to select Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and his cousin, Father John Carroll, as members of the Canadian mission along with Franklin and Chase. To win Canada over to the American cause after a flood of Puritan Pamphlets had abused her people on account of their religion, was an impossible task; but even to have secured her neutrality in the approaching struggle would have been a strategic move of high importance. That the Canadian mission failed, and that Bishop Briand, who saved Canada to the British Empire, scorned Father John Carroll for taking part in a committee representing a Congress which the Quebec prelate believed to be inimical to Catholicism, are unpleasant facts in our history.

Back of Bishop Briand's attitude toward Father Carroll stood Father John McKenna, who had been driven out of the Mohawk Valley, along with his colony of Catholic Highlanders, on account of their Faith. John Carroll had no explanation to offer for the bigotry of the "Address to the People of Great Britain" and to the "Petition to the King," written in 1774 by a Congressional Committee. Still more difficult was it to explain the sublime hypocrisy of the "Address to the Inhabitants of Quebec." And we know from his letters to his mother before starting out on the Canadian mission, that he realized the futility of the long and hazardous journey to Quebec. But the leaders of his country asked him to perform this highly unpleasant task, and he went.

By the time it became necessary to write the grievances of the Americans into a Declaration of Independence from England, the founders of the future Republic had seen, the wisdom of subduing the anti-Catholic sentiments which had fanned the flames of rebellion; and although there is

a hidden allusion to the Quebec Act in the final draft of the Declaration, that cause had served its purpose. To have emphasized it after it had accomplished this purpose, would have been impolitic in view of the assistance the colonists would need from foreign powers, particularly France, then the foremost Catholic nation of the world. The agent of the United States, Silas Deane, was even then in Paris trying to negotiate an alliance with the French Government.

Charles Carroll's Letter of Explanation.

Only one Catholic name is signed to the immortal Declaration--Charles Carroll of Carrollton, then about forty years old, the leading Catholic in the colonies, and one of the wealthiest Americans of that period. Fifty-three years later (1829) when Carroll was ninety-two, he wrote to George Parke Custis, Washington's adopted son: "When I signed the Declaration of Independence, I had in view not only our independence fromEngland, but the toleration of all sects professing the Christian religion and communicating to them all great rights. Happily, this wise and salutary measure has taken place for eradicting religious feuds and persecutions, and become a useful lession to all governments. Reflecting, as you must, on the disabilities, I amy truly say, of the proscription of Roman Catholics in Maryland, you will not be surprised that I had much at heart this grant design founded on mutual charity, basis of our holy religion."

It was Carroll's patriotism that largely influenced the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania to give their whole-hearted support to a movement which needed every man it could count.

Revolution Not Generally Supported.

We are not proud, for the most part, of speaking too openly to the boys and girls in our schools about the division of sentiment among the Americans at the outbreak of the War of Independence. The popular conception of avast uprising of nearly 3,000,000 people to throw off British domination is far from the truth. The colonists were sharply divided into three groups--the Tories or Loyalists to the British crown, the Whigs, and the middle section of American society which looked upon the Tories with dis-

dain and who feared the Whigs as radicals, as agitators, or demagogues.

Without being able to give the exact figures, American historians generally admit that almost two-thirds of our people not only held aloof from the Revolution but also took part within the land in harassing the American rebels. At the height of the War, there were over 200,000 men of military age upon whom Washington should have been free to call; and yet in the spring of 1777, he had not more than 4,000 regular soldiers at his command. Sabine estimates the number of American Tories enrolled during the Revolutionary War in English regiments opposing the Americans as 20,000. How many Tory families fled the country before 1783 it is impossible to state, but it is certain that the number was large.

Catholic Support of Washington.

The Catholics who co-operated in the success of the War of Independence were: those residing in the colonies; the Catholic Indians of Maine and of the old Northwest; Catholic Candaian volunteers in the Continental Army; France, by its alliance of 1778; and Spain, which also secretly aided the Americans in the loan of money and in keeping her colonists in Louisiana, Florida, and Cuba neutral while the issue was being brought to a climax. Many facts might be mentioned, but each of them would take a paper in itself. There are dramatic moments of Catholic participation in the war for independence, and some names are particularly sacred to us: Father Peter Gibault, who assisted our forces in winning the Middle West; Commodore John Barry, the Father of the American Navy; Colonel Stephen Moyland, the Muster-Master-General of the Army, and the brother of the Bishop of Cork; Colonel John Fitzgerald, aide-de-camp and secretary to General Washington; Thomas FitzSimons, the right-hand of Robert Morris in financing the Revolution; Count Pulaski, who was killed at the siege of Savannah, in 1779; the gallant Pole, General Kosiusko; Commodore Grasse; Count Rochambeau; Admiral d'Estang, and a host of others whose names are on the Catholic roll of honor of Founders of the Republic. In his "Hidden Phase of American History" Michael J. O'Brien has thrown a flood of light upon the splendid co-operation of Catholics in winning independence.

The anti-Catholic spirit died out among the real patriots of the Revolutionary war, but it lingered in the hearts of many who hated to see the colonies free and in-

dependent. This point is often overlooked by historians. Not all the Tories or Loyalists, that is those who wished to see our land remain subject to Great Britain, were self-exiled or driven out between 1781 and 1783. Many remained, silent and cautious lest their sentiments become known, and out of this group--each State had such a group--has come all down the decades the adherents of anti-Catholic societies, who, under a hypocritical guise of patriotism, basely turn the liberty Catholics helped to win for them against the Catholics themselves.

Benedict Arnold's Hatred of Catholics.

The anti-Catholicism of the Revolutionary war period has as its outstanding exponent, Benedict Arnold. After his treason (1780), Arnold published his "Address to the Inhabitants of America," justifying his dastardly act; and among the reasons he gives for his disloyalty to the American cause is the fact that he had seen "your mean and profligate Congress at Mass for the soul of a Roman Catholic in purgatory, and participating in the rites of a Church against whose anti-Christian corruption your pious ancestors would bear witness with their blood."

With the war won and peace near at hand, Catholics could look forward with surety to the abolition of all legal and religious disabilities against those of their Faith. Some disillusionment was to follow, but the heart of the country was sound; and while it ook another half-century to free American Catholics from all legal discrimination, religious and political equality came eventually, just at the time the Church was face to face with the problemof the Americanization of the Catholic immigrants from Europe.

Article XlV--The Constitution of the United States and Religious Equality
(1783-1844)

(Our Sunday Visitor, April 8, 1928)

If the years of the War of Independence taught the rebelling colonies any one particular truth removed from the realm of pure politics, it was that the perpetuation of the colonial religious jealousies--Puritan for Anglican, Protestant for Catholic--would undoubtedly be a dangerous factor in the great work that lay ahead, namely, the formation of the Union. A frist plan for the United Government of the States was submitted by Benjamin Franklin in July, 1775, but it was not until July, 1778, that the Articles of Confederation were adopted and signed by the delegates of eight States. When Maryland signed the Articles on March 1, 1781, it may be said that the United States of America came at last into existence. Only one Catholic, so far as known, signed the Articles--Daniel Carroll.

Religiousequality is taken for granted in the Articles and is not mentioned except for a passing phrase linking it up with the possible causes of war against the "firm league of friendship" which the Articles created. Theoretically, the Articles were the only binding power of general movement in the United States until the completion of the framing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787. It was the Congress of the Confederation during this time (1778-1787) which issued the Ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory (July 13, 1787), and in this celebrated document we find for the first time enshrined in its first article the principle of religious freedom: "No person, demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner, shall be molested on account of his mode of worship, or religious sentiments, in the said Territory." It is the same Ordinance that we find the statement (Article 111) which has brought honor to its framers: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Constitution Guards Against Religious Tests.

The Government Printing Office at Washington, D.C., has recently published a large volume entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States." We have, therefore, in this large collection of 1115 pages all the historical papers pertaining to the debates which occurred in Philadelphia during the four summer months of 1787 when the Constitution was written. Reading over these historic pages, we realize that complete religious liberty was never questioned by the delegates who were present, representatives of all but one of the thirteen original States. On Monday, August 20, 1787, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina presented a number of resolutions, among them the following: "No religious test or qualification shall ever be annexed to any oath of office under the authority of the United States." In the discussion on this clause which did not come up until August 30, Pinckney moved to change the text to read: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the authority of the United States." It is this reading which was finally adopted.

It is interesting to note that Roger Sherman of Connecticut thought the clause unnecessary, owing to "The prevailing liberality being a sufficient security against such tests." The only State voting negatively on the clause was North Carolina. Daniel Carroll, who naturally voted in its favor, found himself opposed by his fellow-delegates from Maryland, two of whom, Luther Martin and John Francis Mercer, refused to sign the Constitution after its adoption by the Constitutional convention.

The direct application of this famous clause, which became part of the third section of Article six of the Constitution was to exclude all test oaths for federal office. The emphasis of the last sentence is on the word, federal, because in all the State Constitutions which had been written and adopted from 1776 to 1787, with the exception of Virginia, election to high office was barred to Catholics.

Illiberalism of State Constitutions.

By virtue of these early State Constitutions, South Carolina declared the Christian Protestant Religion to be the established religion of that State; the Massachusetts Constitution permitted the taxation of Catholics and other non-Protestants for the support of Protestant teachers of

religion; and in six other States--North and South Carolina, Georgia, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Vermont--only Protestants could hold office. Delaware, Maryland, Georgia, South Carolina, and New York barred clergymen of all denominations from being elected to the legislature and other high offices in the commonwealth. Rhode Island had not participated in the Constitutional Convention, but so far as its Constitution concerned religious freedom, it needed no change to enable Catholics to occupy places of public trust. New York applied the test oath of all its citizens. This barred Catholics because the oath contained an abjuration of all foreign allegiance "ecclesiastical as well as civil," and was done for the express purpose of excluding Catholics frompublic office. New Jersey allowed only those who professed their belief "in the faith of any Protestant Church" to hold office. Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland allowed Catholics the right to vote.

When the Constitution came before the State Legislatures for consideration, the clause against the test oath in the sixth article aroused considerable discussion. It would take us too far afield to describe the action of each of the thirteen Assemblies. In some of the State Legislatures it was decided that the sixth article did not go far enough in establishing religious equality. In other States, particularly in Massachusetts, fear was expressed over such liberty being granted to Catholics. Major Lusk, amember of the Massachusetts Legislation, openly declared that he "shuddered at the idea that the Roman Catholics might be introduced into office."

Only two Catholics are Signers of the Constitution--Thomas FitzSimons and Daniel Carroll.

The Constitution was adopted by eleven States between December 7, 1787 and July 26, 1788. North Carolina and Rhode Island came into the fold after the new government began its career (April 30, 1789), and the former on November 21, 1789, the latter on May 29, 1790. The first Congress of the United States had as one of its first tasks the settlement of what has since been called the Bill of Rights, namely the acceptance of certain amendments proposed by the States at the time they adopted the Constitution, for the purpose of guaranteeing individual liberty. The first ten amendments were passed and declared to be in force December 15, 1791.

—

Tolerance Provision in Bill of Rights.

It is highly significant that the very first statement in the American Bill of Rights reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, orprohibiting the free exercise thereof." From the outset, therefore, the government of the United States was determined to proclaim and practice, so far as lay within its federal powers, full liberty of conscience to all the inhabitants of our land, and was determined likewise that no restrictions, either on the franchise or on holding publis office should prevail against any man on account of his religious belief.

Far otherwise was it with some of the States. So far as Catholics were concerned, they were free to vote and therefore to hold office in Rhode Island, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland. The franchise was denied them in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, North and South Carolina, and Georgia. The Constitutional Convention had done its utmost by the clear-cut brevity of its attitude on religious equality to ordain liberty of conscience throughout the land; but years were to pass before the eight States just enumerated were to accept complete religious freedom.

The dates are well worth remembering. The first to enfranchise Catholics was South Carolina in its Constitution of 1790. Georgia followed in 1798. New York was the third State to broaden its religious liberty. Although the law of 1700 against "Popish Priests and Jesuits" was repeated in 1784, the test oath, which no Catholic could in conscience take, was passed in 1801, and remained a law until 1806, when on the election of Francis Cooper, a Catholic, to the State Assembly, it was repealed.

Connecticut's Established Church (Congregational) existed for a quarter century after it adopted the national Constitution. No State-Church was stable in the conflicting changes of politics and a new constitution of State was drafted in 1818, in which freedomof worship was made the law. Delaware abolished religious tests by its Constitution of 1831. Puritan bitterness died hard in Massachusetts, and it was only in 1833, forty-six years after the framing of the Constitution of the UnitedStates, that all religious tests for office were abolished and the Protestant Church disestablished from the State. Two years later (1835) North

Carolina abolished its negative form of the test oath in order to allow that great Catholic, Judge William Gaston, to take his seat on the Supreme Bench of the State. The New Jersey Constitution of 1776 discriminated in favor of Protestants and remained in force until 1884, when absolute freedom of worship was guaranteed by the Constitution of that year . The Constitution of New Hampshire of 1791 refused to abolish the test oath which excluded Catholics from high office in that State. In 1876, all religious disqualifications were abolished by the convention of that year, with one exception, namely the clause empowering town to profide, at the expense of all citizens, Catholic and non-Catholic, for the support of Protestant teachers of religion and morality. Various attempts have been made, especially in 1889, to abolish this discrimination but they have all ended in failure. The "Catholic Encyclopedia" justly says that this discrimination "still remains a blot on the fairest and first of all written American State Constitutions."

American Spirit Tolerant

The problem of the absence of power on the part of the national government to prevent State Established Churches while always a grave one, is being met in other ways. What needs to be emphasized is that in every epoch of our national life there have been groups of malcontented individuals whose design it has been to bring back some of the political and religious disabilities which hindered the Catholic Church in colonial days from sharing her marvellous power for righteousness with the better statesmanship of the country.

The American spirit is opposed to religious disabilities of any kind, and every right-thinking citizen instinctively feels that discrimination against any man for holding the highest offices in the land on account of his particular belief is the entering wedge to what would eventually prove to be the undoing of the constitutional guarantees upon which the American Republic is founded. The Federal government has echoed this feeling more than once. In establishing the Northwest Territory (1787) as we have seen, in the legislation for newly-acquired lands, such as Louisiana (1803), Florida (1819), Texas (1848) Alaska (1867), and Porto Rico, Guam and the Philippines (1898), the principle of religious equality has been embodied in the treaties that made these territories parts of the Union.

Article XV--The Rallying of Protestant Forces Against Religious Equality. 1820-44

(Our Sunday Visitor, April 15, 1928)

From the viewpoint of the tenacious survival of Puritan intolerance towards the Catholic Faith in this country, the century and a half that havepassed since the Declaration of Independence may be divided into three parts of fifty years each.

In the first of these periods, from 1776 to 1826, apart from the political discrimination against Catholics in some States where they were refused the franchise or the right to aspire to high office or public trust, there were a few sporadic outbreaks against Catholics which evidenced at the time the hidden forces militating against their peaceful possession of religious freedom. There was an unprovoked riot on Christmas Eve, 1806, when a set of rowdies attempted to destroy St. Peter's Church in Barclay street, New York City; But to offset the memory of this came the celebrated decision in the Confessional Case in 1813, when Counsellor Sampson won a victory for the inviolability of the confessional in acase in which Father Anthony Kohlman, S.J., was instrumental in having goods restored to the rightful owner. Sampson printed the whole case in a pamphlet entitled "The Catholic Question in America."

Proposed Political Restriction on Immigrants.

How far hostility to Catholics was responsible for one of the amendments proposed in 1814 at the Hartford Convention cannot be known with certainty owing to the scarcity of historical data on that first secessionist body in the United States. The amendment in question is one of the first appeals to the American people to raise a barrier to immigration from foreign countries. The newcomers were not to be denied citizenship, but all foreign-born citizens were to be excluded "from the capacity of holding offices of trust, honor, or profit" in the United States.

Hartford Convention 1814

That a great number of the immigrants who arrived in New England from the close of the Revolutionary War up to 1814 were Irish Catholics is the generally accepted opinion of students of our immigration history. It has been estimated that the natural increase of the Catholic body in the United States was from 35,000 in 1790 to 84,000 in 1820. During this same period 77,000 Catholics entered the country, and reliable statistics would give a total of 29.000 Catholics in the newly-acquired territory of Louisiana and Florida. Added to these there are about 5,000 converts, and thus the total Catholic population in 1820 may be placed at 195,000. Moreover, there was a corresponding reaction in Church administration. Where there was one bishop in 1790 (John Carroll), there were in 1820 eight episcopal Sees in the United Statesand a correspondingly larger number of priests than the Church possessed thirty years before. The Irish Catholics outnumbered their co-religionists of other racial stocks, and with their natural facility in politics soon made their influence felt. It is not difficult to understand why they should be, almost to a man, loyal adherents of the Democratic-Republicans, that is, those who opposed the Federalists. This party was the forerunner of the present Democratic party. Nor is it hard to understand as we look down the years from 1815 to within our own times the terms; Irish, Catholic, and Democratic, were almost synonymous. The Naturalization Act which the Federalists passed on July 18, 1798, was closely linked with the Alien and SeditionActs of that same year. The Act required a fourteen years' residence in the country for citizenship and a prior application which had to date five years before the right itself was operative. These restrictions, added to the property qualifications for the franchise, carefully shoulderedpractically all the Catholic newcomers out of politics.

Catholics & Democratic Party

Naturalization act of 1798

Growth of Catholic Influence.

When the Jeffersonian party was swept into power in 1800, it was not long before the Naturalization Act was rescinded and the law of 1795 making five years the necessary residence for citizenship was restored. After that it was only a question of time until the influence of the western states which had entered the Union with manhood suffrage, would carry the East and break down the last barrier between the poor citizen and his more favored brethren. The influence of Catholics in national and state politics grew quickly--too much so for those who believed that the nation's

future depended upon the exclusion of the foreign-born citizen. Up to 1826, however, there was but little to indicate the increasing power of that influence. But it was to develop rapidly owing to several causes. Chief among these was the rise of the first organized anti-Catholic movement which came as the result of Catholic Emancipation in Great Britain in 1829.

Why Protestant Association Failed.

The most vicious attack upon religious and political freedom for Catholics in the British Isles came from the pen of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, who published his "Practical Evidences" to prove, that once the Catholics were free to rise to political preferment, they would exterminate all Protestants. This book was reprinted here in America in 1826 by a committee of the Protestant clergy, headed by Bishop Kemp, in order to arouse American Protestants to the danger of Catholic influence in politics. So much animosity had been created by the the Protestant ministers here, that after the Emancipation Bill became law in 1829, it was not difficult for them to organize the first American Protestant Association in New York City in 1830. The only reason the organization failed was because the different Protestant sects realized that once Catholics were barred from political preferment, each of the non-Catholic denominations would fall a victim to the stronger churches until finally one Protestant church would dominate.

Meanwhile, the Irish Catholic immigration grew in volume and the cities along the Atlantic coastline soon witnessed the banding together of these sons of Erin into political groups for the purposeof securing every right which was legitimately theirs under the American Constitution and of keeping alive in their own hearts the memories of the unspeakable tyranny which had ruined their homeland. In 1835 an attempt was made to organize a political party to oppose foreign citizenship, but the horror felt by all loyal Americans over the outrage upon the nuns of Mount St. Benedict, Charlestown, Mass., in August, 1834, cut the movement short.

Bigotry of Samuel Morse.

That same year (1835), Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, published his "Imminent Dangers

Morse the Bigot

to the Free Institutions of of the United States through Foreign Immigration, and the Present State of the Naturalization Laws." Morse saw in the three charitable missionary Societies of Lyon, Vienna, and Munich, which were then supporting the struggling Church in the United States, the long arm of "European Despotism" and the beginning of papal encroachments on American liberties. He called upon all who agreed with him to form a "a true American Party" in order to stem the tide of Popery in the land. Morse's main thesis, as has been the main thesis of every anti-Catholic agitator in the United States, was that Catholicism and republican institutions were incompatible. "First, shut up your gates," cried Morse. "Stop the Catholics from entering the country," he added, "or you are lost, irrevocably lost." It was during the excitement caused by Morse's writings that Bishop England of Charleston, S.C., published his letters to the "Candid and unprejudiced American people," under the title "The Republic in Danger."

From 1831 until the formation of the Native-American party, there occurred a series of violences which have blackened the fair name of American liberty. The burning of St. Mary's Church in New York City, in 1831, by a band of bigots, gave the impetus to a number of mob attacks. The appointment of Roger Brooke Taney as Attorney-General of the United States by President Jackson in 1831 was another incentive to unspeakable abuse from the Protestant press. The burning of Mount St. Benedict Convent and Academy was the logical culmination of all these appeals to an ignorant and vicious mob spirit. In this last outrage, the Rev. Lyman Beecher, of Park Street Church, Boston, was the acknowledged cause of this brutal act against innocent women and children.

Roger Taney

Beecher

Attacks on Catholic Loyalty.

What the anti-Catholic agitators wished to do was to persuade the rank and file of the American people that free American institutions and the Catholic faith were incompatible. This was the subject of the celebrated debates between Hughes and Breckenridge and between Purcell and Campbell during these years.

Breckenridge

There are so many varied aspects to the anti-Catholicism of this period (1820-1844) that it is difficult to describe the precarious situation in which American Catholic citizens were placed. Some of these movements to curtail their rights were purely of a political order. Others were

the result of racial antipathy between the Puritans and the Celtic ideals. Others again were, let us admit it openly, merely means towards an end on the part of Baptist and Presbyterian ministers of the Gospel who were seeking advancement in their own religious circles. There was abroad in the country a growing prejudice against the Catholic Church, so intense in its religious guise, that no quarter was to be given politically to Catholics.

To corral all this animosity was the work of those who followed in the wake of Morse, Beecher, Breckenridge, Campbell, and Brownlee. The organization of the Native-American party in 1844 was the beginning of a more thorough battle against the political equality of Catholics. If success did not crown the efforts of the Native-Americans, it was due in a large measure to the appeal made all through these years by the greatest Catholic champion the Church of the United States has ever had in its long history, Bishop John England, of Charleston, South Carolina.

Know-nothings

Article XVl--Bishop John England, Champion of Religious Equality

(Our Sunday Visitor, April 22, 1928)

When Bishop John England reached his episcopal See of Charleston at the end of December, 1820, the political and religious condition of the Catholics had changed considerably. Some of the original States preserved their religious test oaths for office and others held to property qualifications for the exercise of the franchise. Among these was one State over whose Catholics he had been given spiritual jurisdiction--North Carolina.

John England was entering upon a territory where social and political intolerance towards Catholics was deeply imbedded in the life of the people; and yet, the very first year of his episcopate proved to the rest of the American bishops that there was a way and a manner of reaching Protestant American minds and hearts--and that was a thoroughgoing spirit of unity, harmony, and understanding of American political ideals. He proved within ayear that Protestant doors, private, public and ecclesiastical, would be opened to Catholic leaders whose hearts were patriotically determined to give the best there was in Catholicism for the moral and intellectual uplift of the people, regardless of creed or social status.

Protestant Pulpits Opened to Catholic Bishop

During that first year he travelled everywhere in the three "Protestant States" of his diocese, and found court houses, public halls, and above all the pulpits of every Protestant denomination opened with a hearty welcome to the Catholic bishop. Protestant ministers vied with one another to secure him for their churches and often, to keep the good will of all, he had to remain long enough in these towns, where probably only a handful of his own people lived, to occupy all its pulpits, and he never preached anything but Catholic doctrine, honestly, without minimizing religious differences between his own faith and the audiences he faced, and with such sincerity of purpose that he won friends everywhere, among those who had never heard the Catholic religion spoken of except in terms of bitter prejudice.

Had the Catholic Church in the United States possessed at this time a hierarchy trained in the same mold as John England, and had we had, at each strategic point where episcopal Sees had been erected, bishops who were able to catch in its fullness the new nationalism which followed the War of 1812, it is quite possible that the eraof anti-Catholicism which set in about 1830 might not have dawned. Within less than two years the enemies of the Church within the Fold, the turbulent trustees of Charleston and other cities, were forced to surrender to a prelate who used two weapons in the swift, short struggle he had with the rebels--the discipline of the Church and the laws of the American Republic.

Bishop's Patriotism Won Good Will

In founding his diocesan Seminary he stressed in no uncertain terms that only those young men would be advanced to the priesthood who joined to sound faith, tried virtue, and extensive knowledge, "an attachment to our republican institutions--men who could be easily assimilated to the climate, and who would feel that they are, as it were, a part of the country itself." There was never any flamboyant patriotism in his speeches and sermons, never any narrow, chauvinistic viewpoint of America's future. The truth was that he loved this new land to which he had come in order to devote his energies to the spiritual advancement of its Catholic citizens, and loved it in such a way that by his very sincerity he won the good-will and even the co-operation of thousands outside the Faith.

His Address to Congress

Probably, the high point in his career as a bishop came when he stood before President John Quincy Adams and Congress, at its invitation, on Sunday, January 8, 1826, to deliver a sermon two and a half hours in length. Here was an occasion when many a less prudent cleric might have taken as his subject the usual patriotisc themes we hear at such assemblies; but those two hours and a half were devoted to the defence of the Catholic doctrine on the meaning of religion, on the duty of worshipping God, and on the obligation of searching after God's truth. And this before a gathering of the legislators of the nation, practically all of whom were Protestants and who had been fully imbued with the popular idea of the incompatibility of the Roman Cath-

olic Faith and republican institutions of America. The only reference he made to the growing animosity of Protestants towards his Church, came at the end: "In these happy and free States we stand upon the equal ground of religious right; we may freely love and bear with each other, and exhibit to Europe a contrast to her jealousies in our affection. By inquiry we shall correct many mistakes, by which our feelings have been embittered; we shall be more bound together in amity, as we become more intimate; and may our harmony and union here below produce that peace and good will that may be emblematic of our enjoyment of more lasting happiness in a better world."

If all of John England's writings may be summed up in a phrase, it is this: that American should be the land where all hatreds expire.

July fourth of that year, 1826, saw the passing into eternity of two of the three surviving signers of the Declaration of Independence--John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, who died a few hours apart on the Golden Jubilee of American freedom. Bishop England could point out to the growing hosts of those who seemed bent upon destroying the Catholic Church in the United States, that the last signer, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, then eighty-nine years old, was a living proof of the harmony that existed between the doctrines of the Church and the ideals of the Republic. Two years later (1829), in his alarm over the growing intolerance in the land, Charles Carroll of Carrollton wrote to George Parke Custis, Washington's adopted son, that when he signed the Declaration, he had in view not only our independence fromEngland, "but the toleration of all sects professing the Christian religion and communicating to them all great rights." "God grant," he wrote that same year to a Protestant minister of New York City, "That this religious liberty may be preserved in these States to the end of all time," and that charity and mutual respect should prevail among all Christian sects.

Chas.
Carroll
last sur-
viving signer
of the
Declaration
of Independence

Turning Point in Protestant Attitude

But that year (1829-30) was to be the turning-point in the Protestant attitude towards Catholicism; and the reader who is interested in the history of religious equality in this country, should compare the "Pastoral Letter to the Laity" which John England wrote at the First Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829, with the "Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States," issued at their General Convention in Philadelphia just a month previous. In the first, the Catholic bishops of the country imposed upon the faithful the duty of charity

and forbearance in the face of the almost nation-wide assault being made upon the Catholic religion. In the other, there is an insidious appeal to force and violence as the best "preventative against Popery." In January 1930, the "Metropolitan" was founded by Archbishop Whitfield for the purpose of keeping the Catholic Question on a higher plane. That same month saw the first issue of the "Protestant" in New York City, and its first page contained an appeal to Protestants to throw off the morbid affection of charity towards Catholics, "If they would not sink under the influence of the papal pestilence."

During the next twelve years, Bishop England expended every effort and used to the utmost all his own personal influence, which was national, to offset what he saw only too visibly on the horizon of American social and religious life--the creation of political parties to drive Catholics out of the land and to foment among the uncultured Protestant bodies a mob spirit which would use violence towards that end.

What he hoped for was that the triennial meetings of the American Bishops at Baltimore in Provincial Councils would brings about a united front against the increase of an evil which could easily plunge the country into civil war; but in this he was disappointed. All along the years when unity of action was so badly needed, Bishop England believed that one phrase summed up the Catholic situation--"Fighting in Detached Squads." He did not hold to the policy taken by his colleagues in the American episcopate of allowing the faithful Catholics of their period to lieat the mercy of the mob rule. He believed in charity and in the doctrine of loving one's neighbor, but the American in him rose in anger more than once when he saw that under the guise of exterminating Catholicism in the land, the intolerant Protestants who were abetting mob violence were striking secretly at the American Constitution by endeavoring to create a union of Church and State in this country.

He Defines Catholic Attitude

And it was the American in him that spoke through the "Pastoral Letter" of 1837, at the height of the frenzy of Protestant bigotry, when he wrote: "We owe no religious allegiance to any State in this union, nor to its general government. No one of them claims any supremacy or dominion over us in our spiritual or ecclesiastical concerns; nor does it claim any such right or power over any of our fellow-citizens now would we submit thereto. They and we, by our constitutional principles, are free to give this ecclesiastical supremacy to whom we please, or to refuse it to every one, if we so think proper; but, they and we owe civil and political allegiance to

the several States in which we reside, and also to our general government. When, therefore, using our undoubted right, we acknowledge the spiritual and ecceslesiastical supremacy of the chief bishop of our universal church, the Pope or bishop of Rome, we do not thereby forfeit our claim to the civil and political protection of the commonwealth; for, we do not detract from the allegiance to which the temporal governments are plainly entitled, and which we cheerfully give; nor do we acknowledge any civil or political supremacy or power over us in any foreign potentate or power, though that potentate might be the chief poastor of our church."

Another Catholic Champion Arises

No man of his times--he died in 1842--in the realm of politics or religion watched more jealously over the preservation of the Republic from intolerance than Bishop England. Fortunately, for the Catholic Church in the United States, another ecclesiastic was then rising to spiritual power--not in such a quiet and charming city of the Southland as Charleston--but in the metropolis of the nation, New York City. Six years before Dr. England's death, John Hughes had been consecrated Coadjutor Bishop of that See, and a few months after Dr. England's death, Bishop Hughes succeeded Bishop Dubois and began that long and valiant career as Catholicism's second great champion of religious equality in the United States.

Bishop Hughes

Article XVll--The Republic in Danger
(1826-1836)

(Our Sunday Visitor, April 29, 1928)

To enter the lists with the constantly increasing groups whose only purpose was to rob Catholics of their civic and religious freedom was not a welcome task a hundred years ago. The foremost apologist the Church in American has produced--Bishop John England, of Charleston, S.C.--was convinced after a score of years spent in the defence of Catholic doctrines and ideals, that it was almost "physically impossible for any American Protestant, however high his rank, exalted his mind, extensive his reading, or comprehensive his charity, to be free from violent prejudice against Catholics."

These words were written in September, 1826, nine months after he had been invited to address Congress at the National Capitol. And yet he realized that someone must attempt a vindication of the Church; otherwise the thousand strains of animosity which were running into the broad river of intolerance for Catholics would one day cause a flood and carry the devastation high up to the Constitution itself. Strictly speaking, Dr. England was the only Catholic Ecclesiastic able to do this at the time.

Condition of Church at That Time.

All was not well with the Catholic Church in the United States at the end of the first golden jubliee of American liberty (July 4, 1826). By that year the original Diocese of Baltimore had been divided into nine episcopal Sees--Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Bardstown, Richmond, Charles, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and New Orleans, with a Vicariate-Apostolic erected for Alabama and Florida, and with Baltimore as an archdiocese.

From 1789, when John Carroll was appointed the first American Bishop, until 1826, when Michael Portier became Vicar-

Apostolic of Alabama-Florida, twenty-one bishops had ruled over Sees within what was then the United States. Only three of these--Archbishops Carroll and Neale of Baltimore, and Bishop Edward Fenwick of Cincinnati--were American-born. To all appearances, in spite of the face that some of the other bishops had become citizens, it looked as if the Church here were being ruled by foreigners. This was not the result of a fixed policy on the part of the Holy See or that of the predominant racial element in the American Priesthood. But it is regrettable that during this first period of our hierarchial organization, the Catholic Church was not led by prelates who could speak to those fomenting opposition to the Faith in terms that Protestant American could not fail to understand.

Dr. England had pointed this out on several occasions to the Holy See, but it was not until the Church here had lost an almost unique opportunity to fashion public opinion that a change was made in filling our vacant Sees. Moreover, disunion and disorder were present in many of the large Catholic centers, and the good name of Catholic charity was being smirched as never since in our history. It was in the midst of this disorder and lack of homogeneity with American customs that staggering blows such as Blanco White's "Practical Evidences" were given to Catholicism.

Bishop England Bore Brunt of Fight.

The word was common on thousands of lips that had been taught by Protestant ministers eager to seize the chance to prevent the increase of Catholic influence in politics, that Catholicism and republican principles were incompatible. The "Republic in Danger" was the caption to many articles in the Protestant religious press, and with so few exceptions that are negligible, Dr. England bore the brunt of the fight for a better understanding of Catholic principles from 1822 to 1842. His "Letters to the Roman Catholics of the United States" were begun that year, and were a vindication of the Catholic Church against her enemies; but his was only one voice in the midst of a national Catholic silence. For over a year, week by week, he published these sturdy answers to all the charges, taken from White's book, which furnished the Protestant press with its diatribes; and he did so, he says, not only to vindicate the Faith but to awaken the slumbering consciences of American Catholics, prelates, priests, and people, to the fearful results of the growing intolerance all about them.

Only at the risk of disobeying the Holy See, did Arch-

bishop Whitfield of Baltimore agree to the first Provincial Council of our bishops in 1829. Then it was too late to stem the tide of furious invective which was being zealously fed up to this year by the English, Irish, British, and American Protestants who were determined if possible to kill the Catholic Emancipation Bill then before the British Parliament. When that effort failed, this country was swept by the rantings of agents from the Orange Lodges for the purpose of organizing a national American Party. The creed of the Nativists was "Put only Americans in office," and by Americans, they meant Protestant Americans, whether these were native born or not. The Provincial Council of 1829 issued a Pastoral Letter to the Laity which contained a stirring appeal for fraternal charity, but it was hardly printed before the American Protestant Association was founded in New York.

Beginnings of Catholic Press

What saved the Catholic Church from becoming the object of a nationwide hatred was due to the fact that the Protestant churches were filled with liberal-minded men and women who looked with disfavor upon the intolerance of the "Saints" or "Evangelicals" as the Puritan group in Protestantism was then called. It was to these fair-minded Americans that Dr. England addressed his next great series of Letters, entitled "The Republic in Danger," which appeared each week in the newspaper he had founded in 1822--"The United States Catholic Miscellany." In these trenchantpages he broke completely with the reserved and dignified way he had treated the assailants of Catholicism up to that time and came out boldly with challenge after challenge to non-Catholics to prevent the "Evangelicals" from wrecking the Constitutional freedom of the land. The "Truth Teller" had been started by Father John Power and others in New York, in 1825, and there came into the field with the next decade twelve Catholic newspapers which took up valiantly the cause of religious equality--"The Catholic Press," Hartford, Connecticut, 1829; "The Jesuit," Boston, 1829; "The Irishman and Charleston Weekly Register" 1829 "The Irish Shield and Monthly Milesian," New York, 1829; 'The Expositor or Young Catholic's Guide," Boston, 1830; "The Irishman," New York, 1831; "The Catholic Telegraph," Cincinnati, 1831; "The United States Catholic Intelligencer," Boston, 1831; "The Shepherd of the Valley," St. Louis, 1832; "The Catholic Herald," Philadelphia, 1833; "The New York Weekly Register and Catholic Diary," 1833; and "The Catholic Journal," Washington, D.C. 1833.

Jackson's Victory Brought Change.

When the anti-Federalists (the Democrats of today) won the election which brought Andrew Jackson out of the Middle West to the Presidency, a definite change occurred in anti-

Catholic political manoeuvers. Catholics, especially those of Irish blood, rejoiced in what was tantamount to a clean-cut triumph over the Federalist movement to rob them of their civic rights by extending the number of years for citizenship. There is, therefore, something deeper than than newspaper enterprise in the rise of these Catholic weeklies in all the larger cities of the Union. The secular press was being made the channel of considerable anti-Catholic abuse under the guise of political news after the victory of Emancipation in Great Britain, and Jackson's election, occuring that same year (1829), stirred the "Evangelicals" as never before in our history.

John Gilmary Shea writes of the situation at that time as follows: "Meanwhile the anti-Catholic feeling was gaining ground silently, and becoming, though no one seemed to comprehend the fact, a menace to the peace and harmony of the country, without one redeeming element, but fraught with dangerous disregard of the rights of fellow-citizens to life and property. This dangerous condition pervaded the whole country, encouraged and stimulated by men who professed the most religious principles but which needed only a pretext to burst out into open violence."

Jackson's Appointment of Taney

The attack on the Catholic Church as a menace to American liberties reached a first pitch of frenzy when President Jackson appointed Roger Brooke Taney Attorney-General of the United States in 1831, and the "Saints"--as Bishop England and many level-headed Protestants called the Puritans--believed that at last the United States would be ruled directly from Rome, since this highest legal post in the Cabinet was held by a Catholic. A fair summary of the thousands of letters and editorials in the Protestant press of the day would read as follows:

1. A Roman Catholic can be in principle a faithful subject of a Protestant government, only when an unfaithful subject of the Pope.

2. A consistent Papist, and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration, must be incompatible, so long as the Pope shall claim jurisdiction over all Christendom, and the Roman Church shall continue to maintain that faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics.

This statement of the Catholic question was written by Rev. Wm. Hawley, D. D., during his incumbency of the United States Senate.

The selection of Mr. Taney as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to succeed the Immortal Marshall, in 1836, gave an added impetus to the unhold crusade against American Catholicism, and it was only the stirring happenings of Jackson's administration--we wereperilously near war with France in 1835-1836-- that prevented a coalition of the anti-Catholic battalions. The Fathers of the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore (1833) had not failed to foresee the grave danger their flocks ran should open violence occur and they besought the faithful to refrain from retribution of any sort except in a legitimate constitutional way. Bishop England wrote the Pastoral Letter of 1833. One sentence is wrothy of repetition to show the intensity of the situation: "Not only do they assail us and our institutions in a style of vituperation and offense, misrepresent our doctrines, vilify our practices, repeat the hundred times refuted calumnies of days of angry and bitter contention in other lands, but they have even denounced you and us as enemies to the liberties of the republic, and have openly proclaimed the fancied necessity of not only obstructing our progress, but of using their best efforts to extirpate our religion."

Celebrated Debates

There were present at the Council of 1833 two outstanding figures who were later to make afruitless attempt to bring the whole problem of the Catholic Question to the higher realmof dignified controversy--Bishop John Purcell of Cincinnati, and Father John Hughes, then stationed at St. John's Church, Philadelphia. Two volumes exist containing the discussions of the two celebrated debates in which they participatingduring the years 1836-1837--the Hughes-Breckenridge Debate, held in Philadelphia in April-May, 1836, and the Purcell-Campbell Debate, held in Cincinnati, January 13-21-1837. Both Debates centered around the question: Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil and Religious Liberty? These two volumes are forgotten by our generation, but they are as fresh and vigorous today as when they were first printed nearly a century ago.

Hughes vs. Breckenridge

Purcell vs. Campbell

Article XVIII-Anti-Catholic Literature

(Our Sunday Visitor, May 6, 1928)

No two facts are more outstanding in what is now known as the period of Jacksonian Democracy (1829-1841) than the advent of the "common man" in party politics and the sudden rise and growth of scurrilous literature against the Catholic Faith. By the time the American Protestant Association was organized in New York (1830), the Protestant press had so swollen the Catholic Question out of proportion that it would be difficult to describe the revivals that had occurred in Protestant denominational churches without centering them around the inherent fear of the Catholic Church which somehow the descendants of the Puritans had not been able to overcome. The very elements in the social and intellectual life of the United States which should have lowered the barriers of intolerance--the spread of democratic ideas, a more widely diffused knowledge of Catholic life, as lived by the thousands of immigrants who flocked to our country, the growth of industrial life, of business and of commerce, in all three of which there was little if any spur to mark off creed from creed--these factors apparently failed to produce abetter feeling among the younger and more vigorous-minded Americans of the day.

Out of the same Middle West whence had come the hosts which had sent John Quincy Adams and his New England Puritan backing down to defeat in 1828, and had forced into the Presidency the "Man of the People," Andrew Jackson, came a goodly group of religious leaders who meant to save the East from another kind of corruption--"Romanism." It was an idle fancy of the editors of our Catholic newspapers to hope that the points of controversy on the Catholic Question would keep to the high, dignified, and intelligent plane of pure controversy. There had been controversies where the evident purpose on both sides was to clarify the question at issue.

Carroll-Wharton Controversy.

Nothing nobler in the English language exists than the controversy which occurred in 1784 between our first bishop, John Carroll, and his apostate cousin, the former Jesuit, Charles Wharton. The subjects discussed were infallibility, transubstantiation, and the problem of salvation outside the Catholic Church. Carroll's "Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States" is by far the most brilliant controversial tract of its day. The controversy between the noted Boston Convert, Father John Thayer, and the Rev. George Leslie, a Congregationalist minister, in 1793, again centered around the question of infallibility, and both opponents displayed an uncommon erudition and ability of presentation. A controversy in 1819, between Father Leonard Edelen, S.J., and the Rev. John Brady, of the Episcopal Church, was on the Church's attitude towards the Bible. During the next decade and a half (1820-1836), the Catholic newspapers were practically all engaged in controversy with local Protestant ministers, and among these weekly papers, the one which bore the brunt of the nation-wide opposition to Catholicism was Bishop England's "United States Catholic Miscellany," which he founded in 1822. Even he, gallant and courteous fighter though he was, soon realized that the gentlemanly days of theological dispute were gone.

A definite date cannot be given to the change. But it is part of that great frontier movement which historians today accept as the explanation of all nineteenth-century American history. The trek westward had begun and before the American Revolution and grew in volume as the territories in the Middle West became States. A working theory for the political and religious situation at the time (1830-1835) would be that the cities in the East were already throbbing with Catholic life and that the Middle West, the "Valley", as it was called, was tobe saved by all means from the inroads of the Catholic immigrant.

Bishop England has a paragraph in the "Catholic Miscellany" for July 4, 1835, which describes this attitude of mind: "How common has been the expedient, employed by missionaries from the west, in the eastern states, of raising money for education or for religion, upon the allegation that it was necessary to prevent the ascendency of the Catholics? How often has it been asserted, throughout the last ten years, that this was the field on which the papists had erected their standard, and where the battle must be fought for civil and religious liberty?

What tales of horror have been poured into the ears of the confiding children of the pilgrims, of young men emigrating to the west, marrying Catholic ladies, and collapsing without a struggle into the arms of Romanism; of splendid edifices undermined by profound dungeons, prepared for the recepting of heretic Republicans; of boxes of firearms secretly transported into hidden receptacles, in the very bosom of our flourishing cities; of vast and widely ramified European conspiracies by which Irish Catholics are suddenly converted into lovers of monarchy and obedient instruments of King!"

The Abuse of Catholics.

The abuse of Catholics had by this time become a trade and into the whirlpool of the animosities created there was flung a host of anti-Catholic tracts and books which dragged the old-time controversies to a base and obscene slough. In vain did the better-minded Protestant leaders, cleric and lay, strive to prevent this degradation of what they believed to be a legitimate method of combating the advancing hosts of Catholicism.

The Catholics in 1835 formed a minority of less than one twenty-fifth part of the population of the United States, and by many liberal-minded Protestant editors, it was acknowledged to be the height of the ridiculous to see the anti-Catholic press constantly repeating the charge that 500,000 American Catholics could be a menace to the liberty of nearly 12,000,000 American Protestants, while, as one editor puts it, "the great elements of power, physical and moral, such as the wealth, the literature, the education, the press, the government of the country, are almost exclusively in Protestant hands. It is useless to accumulate arguments on such premises."

Political Aspects of Anti-Catholic Campaign.

The political aspect of the abuse heaped upon the Church was subordinated at this period to the crusade against the moral character of Catholics, especially in regard to the clergy and the nuns. Another passage from John England's usually restrained pen reveals the hideousness of the attack--"We are so so tired and disgusted with the relentless outpourings of fanaticism, and rank, loathsome filth collected and swept to our doors by every vehicle of revolting bigotry, that we are wearied with the task imposed upon us, of refuting today the

charge we must meet afresh tomorrow......If we destroy our altars, demolish our churches, burn our records, our olden documents--stand forth tomorrow as ready to embrace what we are told we knew not before, the correct knowledge of what the Redeemer taught, and what is worse if we be, as we are, told to seek for that amongst wrangling, jarring sects, before what tribunal in the United States must the Catholic Question in American receive the final decision? It is high time to answer this Question. Misrepresentation and calumny and slander have had their long day......Let the sect of Protestantism be named to which we must adhere in preference to all others, and thus claim for itself the prerogative of infallibility we then shall find something tangible, something beyond the mere empty sound of the Religion of the Bible and such loose phraseology, and then and not till then can we with that sect, the Ajax of the Protestant religion, adjust the difference between it and mother church and thus decide the Catholic Question in American."

fine argument

The Catholic Church in the United States, a century ago, was in a somewhat singular situation. From Maine to Florida and westward to the Mississippi, Catholics were assailed by every species of calumny and vituperation. What the opposition wanted to produce, no man knew then, no man knows now. What was expected as a result of the wave upon wave of slander and misrepresentation that swept the Barque of Peter, no man who reads this contemporary literature can form the least logical idea.

Scurrilous Attacks on Priests and Nuns

No complete study has ever been made of the anti-Catholic literature in the United States during the nineteenth century. Bishop England listed the number of Protestant newspapers devoted to scurrilous attacks upon the Catholic clergy and sisterhood as almost four hundred.

But the chief weapon was the printed book and pamphlet. To list all that were issued during the period previous to the Civil War would fill several columns. Lyman Beecher, who was principally responsible for the mob that burned the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834, wrote his "Plea for the West," the following year in order to arouse Protestants to the danger the "Valley" ran from Romanism; and two years later Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures" appeared, fostered by a publishing house of New York City which has become quite prominent since that date. Other volumes published during this period of frenzied attack on the Church were: "The Convents' Doom," "Party Spirit and Popery, or the Beast and his Rider", "Romanism Incompatible with Republican Institutions", "A Treatise on the Jesuits", "Pope or President," "Six Hours in a Convent", "The Master Key to Popery", "A Letter from Rome Showing the Exact Conformity of Popery and Paganism",

Beecher

"Popery Unmasked", "Nunneries as They Are", "Six Months in a Convent", and a number of novels, chief of which were: "Rosamund Culbertson", "Hannah Corcoran", "Louise, a Canadian Nun", and "Father Clement."

There could be but one logical outcome from the flood of abuse these volumes created. Read with avidity in the backwoods and in the rural districts where the hawkers and peddlers stopped on their journey where they filled a want in minds that were stagnant from the lack of external interests, this literature sold as did no other kind in the United States before this time. The Yankee peddler was never at a loss to sell his stock of books, and wandering preachers and colporteurs of the American Tract Society visited an amazing number of families distributing volumes that were almost without exception breeders of a prejudice and error against the Catholic Faith which have never been eradicated.

The Puritan Literature.

Probably nothing has done so much to create anti-Catholic sentiment in the whole history of the Church as the Puritan literature in the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century. The alarm had been sounded after the war of 1812, when Catholic immigration became a formidable social and religious factor in national life, and the steady stream of villification coming from the Protestant religious newspapers, from vicious and obscene pamphlets, tracts, and books, inevitably brought the issue of Americanism and Catholicism to what is probably its highest level in our history. Prejudice that had become ingrained as the result of centuries of abuse and misrepresentation in Protestant England and Scotland needed little impetus towards the violent outbreaks of the two decades immediately before the Civil War. It is all a sad commentary on the message George Washington gave to his Catholic fellow-citizens in 1790: "As mankind become more liberal they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the Community are equally entitled to the protection of civil Government. I hope ever to see American among the foremost Nations in example of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of their Government: or the important assistance which they received from a Nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

Article XIX--The Pioneer Catholic Press.
(1810-1861)

(Our Sunday Visitor, May 13, 1928)

No chapter in the history of the Catholic Question in the United States is more important than that describing the origin and progress of our American Catholic newspapers and periodicals.

Here is a noble theme awaiting a just and adequate study at the hands of a competent historian.

In the story of the Catholic press in this country we reach what may well be called the first heroic heights of the gallant efforts Catholics have always made to promote harmony in American social and religious life. The purpose of the Catholic newspaper fromthe beginning was not only to make known to its readers items of current interest, but also to assist the clergy in clearing away that uncommon mass of prejudice and animosity towards the Church which the colonial period had so deliberately and so successfully fostered.

No country in the world depends more largely than our own upon the public press for the formation of public opinion. As in other lands where Protestantism counts its adherents in greater numbers than the Catholic Church, the power of the press in the United States has always been an uncertain factor in the promotion of religious equality.

In colonial times, from the year 1690 onwards, there were newspapers in many of the leading cities and towns, and it is safe to say that, apart from scattered notices which helf us to follow the story of Catholic immigration into the colonies, all these newspapers were dominated by the No Popery spirit of the colonial charters and legislation.

After the War of Independence, American newspapers and periodicals of a religious character sprang up all over the new Republic. These were in most cases violently anti-Catholic. They were founded for the express purpose of carrying

the prejudices and hatreds of the Puritan colonial mind into our national life. With rare exceptions, the ethics of these Protestant editors seldom rose above the range of misrepresentation and unfairness in dealing with Catholic topics. If the secular press of the early decades of the nineteenth century was anti-English, it was also anti-Irish. The religious faith of the Irish newcomers was too closely bound up with the political struggle for Catholic freedom in Great Britain and Ireland for our newspapers to treat them with justice and fairness.

Catholic Press Started by Irish.

The first newspapers under Catholic management, therefore, were Irish journals founded by exiles from Erin who realized the power of the press in keeping the American mind properly informed on the fight for political and religious freedom across the seas. The earliest of these weeklies was the "Shamrock or Hibernian Chronicle," begun in New York, on December 10, 1810, by Thomas O'Conor, the father of the great jurist, Charles O'Conor. The chief questions dealt with in its columns were the agitation for the Repeal of the Union and Catholic Emancipation. In treating these, its editor had to cope week by week with malignant prejudices against Ireland and the Catholic Faith. The illustrious Doctor William MacNeven, who contributed to its columns, says that such a periodical was then a vital necessity in the United States, because "the same violence and invective, the same violation of truth, the same distortion of the past, that marked the conduct of the British faction towards the United Irishmen in Europe, have been revived here by the retainers and hirelings of the same enemy."

To any one who is familiar with the bitterness of these first decades of the nineteenth century--a bitterness which was to reach a climax in the abortive attempt at seccession from the United States by New England--the courage of these Irish exiles in facing their hereditary enemies is one of the finest things in the history of American Journalism. The high-water mark of its power was reached by the "Shamrock" when it successfully helped to defeat Rufus King for Governor of New York in 1816. King had been minister to Great Britain from 1798 to 1804, and was largely responsible for the unnecessary cruelty shown to the United Irishmen after the failure of the Rebellion of '98. Charles O'Conor has written a just epitaph to this first Catholic newspaper. He tells us that his father's talents were "Ever directed

in vindicating the fame of Ireland, the honor of our American States, and the truth and purity of his cherished mother, the Apostolic Church."

The "Shamrock" was followed (1819) by the "Globe and Emerald" of New York City, which devoted its colums to attacking Federalist politics, boldly and fearlessly asserting the rights of Irishmen to American citizenship.

First Distinctively Catholic Weekly.

In June, 1822, appeared the first issue of our first distinctively religious weekly--the "United States Catholic Miscellany," founded by Bishop John England of Charleston.

The object of the "Miscellany" was to meet a well-recognized need in Catholic American life.. At the time Bishop England ventured to enter the precariously-supported field of Catholic journalism, the Protestant religious newspapers were not only numberous, but were busily fanning the smoldering flames of religious bigotry. With but few exceptions in those days, the ranks of the Protestant ministry were filled with men whose best asset was their forensic power of denunciation of all things Catholic. Dr. England's "Miscellany" was quickly understood by these defamers of the Catholic Faith as a courageous effort to place before the reading public answers to the charges that formed the warp and woof of the Protestant press and as a keen and profound attack upon what undoubtedly has never died out in the Puritan mind of American--the determination to form a union of Protestant Church and American State. It was not without vision into that future which is part of our immediate present that led the young Bishop of Charleston to place as a motto to the "Miscellany" the first amendment to the Federal Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Bishop England's example was not lost upon his fellow-priests, and during the twenty years of his editorship of the "Miscellany" other Catholic weekly newspapers were founded in the more populous centers of the country. Among these were the "Truth Teller," founded by his life-long friend, Father John Power, in New York City in 1825; the "Catholic Press," started at Hartford, Conn., in 1829, under Bishop

Fenwick's guidance, the first number of which was greeted by the editor of the "Connecticut Observer" with the appeal, "How will it read in history that in 1829, Hartford in the State of Connecticut, was made the center of a Roman Catholic Mission?"

A year later, when the "Observer" had failed to arouse the readers to rise up and destroy the little Catholic church in that city, every street was placarded with the following printed notice: "To the Public. Be it known unto far and near that all Catholics and all persons in favor of the Catholic church are a set of vile impostors, liars, villains and cowardly cut-throats. I bid defiance to that villain, the Pope. A True American."

Beginning of Boston Pilot.

The "Catholic Press" was followed by the "Jesuit and Catholic Sentinel" founded that same year (1829) by Bishop Fenwick of Boston. In the files of the "Jesuit" we find the best historical material for that outrage upon the Ursuline nuns of Charlestown, which Bishop England always called the "Shame of Massachusetts." In 1835, the title of the Boston weekly was changed to the "Literary and Catholic Sentinel," and the following year it became the "Boston Pilot," now one of the oldest and most influential Catholic newspapers in the United States.

Meanwhile, in other cities, Catholic weekles were started. In Cincinnati, the "Catholic Telegraph" began its long and successful career in 1831, and two years later under the direction of the future Archbishop of New York, Father John Hughes, the "Catholic Heràld" was established in Philadelphia. Out in St. Louis, the "Shepherd of the Valley" was begun in 1832, and in 1835 at Bardstown, Ky., the "Catholic Advocate" was founded. In 1837, the first German Catholic weekly, "Der Wahrheitsfreund," was started in Cincinnati. In 1840, the "Freeman's Journal" was established in New YorkCity, and in 1842, the first successfuly French weekly, "La Propagateur Catholique," was begun in New Orleans.

In 1844, the Pittsburgh "Catholic" was launched by Bishop O'Connor, and the "Catholic Mirror" of Baltimore, which made its appearance in 1849, was to last up to 1908, when it was succeeded by the "Baltimore Catholic Review," one of the best conducted newspapers in the country. In 1852, Thomas D'Arcy McGee began publishing his "American Celt,"

which became five years later the "New York Tablet," the most literary of our weeklies in the years immediately preceding the Civil War. At the time the Civil War broke out, each Catholic center of importance had its weekly or monthly newspaper. Accurate data concerning all these periodicals is not easily ascertained; but from a list published in 1893 by the late Rev. Dr. Middleton, O.S.A., of Villanova, it is evident that the Catholic press suffered many failures owing to the economic crisis of the decade before the war.

During this first period of Catholic journalism (1810-1865) many other ventures were made with weekly and monthlyperiodicals, but only the few of the newspapers mentioned above have lasted until our day. When the time comes to write the complete history of the Catholic Question in this country, all these periodicals will be found to contain valuable material on the progress of the ideal of religious equality in the United States.

Leadership of the "Catholic Miscellany."

Among all these weeklies founded before the Civil War, the "Catholic Miscellany" of Charleston never lost its leadership in Catholic journalism. In 1856, Archbishop Hughes could write in his "Reflections on the Catholic Press in the United States" that the "Miscellany" had sustained itself throughout with a dignity and an erudition such as had not been surpassed by any Catholic periodical in the country.

A complete history of the Catholic press during this first epoch of its existence would reveal the names of many cultured priests, laymen and laywomen who devoted themselves at great personal sacrifice to the litery and apologetic development of this arm of Catholic defence. Thomas F. Meehan has listed the more important names in his articles on the Catholic press in the "Catholic Builders of the Nation." In the record of the rise and progress of the Catholic press of the United States, he writes, "there is many a story of disappointed hopes, wrecked ambitions, and unselfish zeal and sacrifice requited with neglect and ingratitude." It was the unflagging zeal of our Catholic editors and writers from 1810 to 1861 which prepared the way for the great flowering of Catholic journalism during the past fifty years.

C. P. A. and N. C. W. C. Services.

The changes that have occurred in Catholic journalism since the Civil War, especially through the action of the Catholic Press Association and the News Service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, are the oustanding factors of a new era in the history of the Catholic press. When

one looks back upon this pioneer period, the truth is borne in upon us that in spite of its failures, without the militant Catholic newspapers of the years prior to the Civil War, the antagonism towards Catholic progress deeply ingrained in the hearts of many outside the Church would today be far more vigorous and strident.

Our bishops have never faltered in their realization of the necessity for a strong Catholic press to stem the waters of prejudice and misunderstanding. In their Pastoral to the Laity in 1829, the Fathers of our first Provincial Council called upon the faithful to support Catholic publications and to read and spread Catholic literature. "If you look around and see how many newspapers," they wrote, "are maintained for their own purposes by our separated brethren, it will indeed be a matter of reproach should we not uphold at least a few of our own." In the next Council (1833) the Fathers noticed with regret " a spirit exhibited by some of the conductors of the press engaged in the interests of those brethren separated fromour communion, which has, within a few years become more unkind and unjust in our regard."

Their hopes were strengthened by the fact that six Catholic weeklies had been established between the two Councils (1829-1833). In the Pastoral Letter of 1837, the Fathers exhorted the faithful "to sustain with better efforts those journals which, though not officially sanctioned by us, still are most useful to explain our tenets, to defend our rights, and to vindicate our conduct. We regret to learn that in several instances those conducted under the eye of the ordinary ecclesiastical authority are continued only as a pecuniary sacrifice to their proprietors, and by the zealous and gratuitous exertions of their editors. We would impress upon you the necessity of exertion of your parts, to have them better sustained and their circulation extended as widely as possible."

Hierarchy's Appeal For Catholic Press.

A change was noticeable three years later at the fourth Provincial Council (1840), a change no doubt due to the energetic defence of the Catholic newspapers then in existence in all the larger American centers of population. The Fathers write that "it does not appear to us at the present moment that (the Protestant newspapers) are conducted with the same violence nor upon the same preconcerted action for our destruction." All along the yearsof organized hierarchial life under our archbishops and bishops, our leaders have recognized that the power of the press is one of the most

striking features of the modern society. In the Pastoral issued after the Civil War (1866) we find a summary of the splendid work accomplished for the Faith by the Catholic newspapers of this first epoch. "It is our duty," the Fathers write, "to avail ourselves of this mode of making known the truths of our Religion, and removing the misapprehensions which so generally prevail in regard to them. If many of these papers are not all that we would wish them to be, it will be frequently found that the real cause of their shortcomings is the insufficient support they receive from the Catholic Public."

There is another statement, made in the Pastoral Letter of the last Plenary Council (1884), which should be quoted here, since it echoes many of the letters from the members of our hierarchy in this earlier period. It is as follows: "Finally, Christian parents, let us beg your earnest consideration of this important truth, that upon you, singly and individually, must practically depend the solution of the question, whether or not the Catholic press is to accomplish the great work which Providence and the Church expect of it at this time. So frequently and so forcibly has the providential mission of the press been dwelt upon by Popes and prelates and distinguished Catholic writers, and so assiduously have their utterances been quoted and requoted everywhere, that no one certainly stands in need of arguments to be convinced of this truth. But all this will be only words in the air, unless it can be brought home to each parent and made practical in each household. If the head of each Catholic family will recognize it as his privilege and his duty to contribute towards supporting more Catholic periodicals, and keeping himself well acquainted with the information they impart, then the Catholic press will be sure to attain to its rightful development and to accomplish its destined mission."

To these proofs of the power of the Catholic press to preserve in a pure and wholesome way the true Faith in the hearts of our boys and girls, the future men and women upon whom we must depend for an intelligent defense of Catholic doctrine, we may add the solemn words of that saintly Pontiff, Pius X: "In vain will you build churches, give missions, found schools--all your works, all your efforts, will be destroyed if you are not able to wield the defensive and offensive weapon-a loyal and sincere Catholic press."

Catholicism' Debt to Its Press.

If the Catholic Question in the United States is today better understood by those outside the Church, if there

is less tendency to fall into the old colonial No Popery method of attacking Catholicism, if those who are desirious of continuing the warfare against Catholic truth are today more cautious in their statements, it is because the Church in this country can look back in pride upon a host of devoted men and women, priests and bishops, who spent themselves in the cause of the Catholic press. Some day their story will be told; and when it is, it will be found that in the enlightenment they brought into the darkness outside the Church, our Faith has no sons and daughters more worthy of our praise and our undying gratitude.

Article XX---Native-Americanism. 1844.

(Our Sunday Visitor, May 20, 1928)

Stripped of all its lies and subterfuges, Native-Americanism means nothing less than this: the United States is a Protestant country; Catholics are permitted to come here, and to make their homes, and to enjoy that which apparently is of supreme importance to them, namely, the free exercise of their religious worship; but beyond this right which is written into the Constitution, they are to be thwarted in every legitimate or illegitimate way frompolitical equality with their fellow-citizens of non-Catholic faiths.

By the time the Catholic bishops met at the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1837, anti-Catholic prejudice had become so fully engrained in the minds of thousands of American Protestants that violence could not be far off. The terms used in the Protestant press to describe Catholics were "foreigners," "paupers," "monarchists," "enemies of the Republic," and those used to describe the Church were of a kind that no newspaper would print today.

Two Vicious Volumes.

Two vicious volumes had appeared in 1835 and 1826, and they literally flooded the country. Catholics who wonder today why so many in our rural districts still harbor suspicions and still believe calumnies about the religious life of our nuns, need to recall the fact that Rebecca Reed's "Six Months in a Convent," published in 1835, and Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," issued the following year, were bought with avidity; so much so that the publishers could hardly keep pace with the current sales. Peddlers and hawkers reaped a harvest in the rural districts where those obscene books were largely read and believed, and even today, our missionaries in the Middle West and in the South find it necessary to answer lies that have been handed down for two generations onthe Sisterhoods.

It was to the advantage of the fighting Puritans, in their determination to prevent "the spread of Popery," to close up every channel to the truthful explanation of Catholic doctrines. Protestant ministers--these were Church-

going days, when Sunday was devoted to religious exercises either in church or at home--made the most of their opportunity as leaders of the people to inflame minds and hearts against Catholicism. Schools and colleges were still largely denominational at the time, and no "Commencement" was properly rounded out without the usual attack on "Popery." So widespread had the movement grown that proposals were made by leading Protestants who recognized the evil of religious rancor, to found a Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, into which all might come for the preservation of religious tolerance.

But it was all in vain. Violence was on the horizon of the religious life of the nation. All that was needed was the organization of the movement into one body. The bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church had failed with their "Pastoral Letter" of 1829 to carry their appeal to force as a preventative against Catholicism. Rev. Lyman Beecher found himself in no enviable position among his co-religionists for his part in the burning of the Charlestown Ursuline Academy in 1834. It was a Protestant who revealed the base calumny of Maria Monk's production of 1836. Protestant editors warned ministers who were desirous of entering the lists of controversy in 1837 that there was nothing more fatal to Protestant ascendency that open debate with Catholic divines. The American Protestant Association of 1830 had proven by its failure to live that the various sects would never work in harmny, even with so attractive a gage as the overthrow of Romanism. And meanwhile, all through these decades (1820-1846), Catholics were coming into the country in astounding numbers and were wielding legitimate political influence to protect their Faith.

Beecher

Rise of Native American Party.

We should be careful, however, to view this unfortunate alignment of Americansinto hostile groups solely from the religious standpoint. There are, indeed, many aspects to the anti-Catholicism of the days of Andrew Jackson (1829-1837). The overwhelming victory of the anti-Federalists in 1828 and 1833 and the realization in 1836 that Martin VanBuren, Calhoun's successor as Vict-President, would succeed to the presidency, aroused the old fighting spirit of the Whigs, as the successors of the Federalists were now called. Catholics were identified with the Democrats for several reasons, not the least of which was the stand taken by the Whigs on the naturalization laws. From this viewpoint the rise of the Native American Party can be charged to political conditions. There was, moreover, especially in New England, a profound racial issue between

Why Catholics were identified with the Democrats

the native-born and the newcomers, and added to this innate distrust between Americans of English and Scottish blood towards the race their ancestors had brutally tyrannized over for centuries, was an economic problem that went even deeper to the social life of the times. The labor market was over-stocked by the influx of the newcomers, and no small percentage of the antagonism against the Catholic Church was due to the fact that the alien laborer, largely unskillled, had become a serious factor in the question of a living wage for those whose families had been here before the Revolution.

The origin of the Native-American Party is not known with certainty. Much has been written on this politi-co-religious group and on its successor in the field, the Know-Nothings. If their own histories are to be trusted, the first meeting held was that at Germantown, Pa., in 1837, when a constitution was framed and adopted, and the platform of the Party expressed in these words: "While, at the same time, we invite the stranger, worn down by the opposition at home, to come and share with us the blessings of our native land--here find an asylum for his distress, and partake of the plenty a kind Providence has so bountifully given us, we deny his right (hereby meaning as foreigner any immigrant who may hereafter arrive in our country) to have a voice in our legislative halls, his eligibility to office under any circumstances, and we ask a repeal of that Naturalization Law (1790), which, it must be apparent to every reflecting mind, to every true son of America, has now become an evil."

This initial stage was not followed up with sufficient zest, and, as the "Nativists" saw, had no effect on keeping the Catholic Irish fromoffices of trust and profit under the Constitution. The leaders of the movement were always somewhat boisterous in their assurance that nothing was contemplated which would interfere with the religious tenets of the Church. It was simply an effort to save American for those who founded it--the Protestant churches.

American Republican Association.

A second meeting took place in Philadelphia in December, 1843, and a society was formed--The American Republican Association. In its Declaration of Principles, we read: "We hold that native Americans, only, should be appointed to office, to legislate, administer, or execute the laws of their own country." A similar organization was created in New York the following year and soon gained sufficient force to elect James Harper mayor of the city. In Philadelphia there was a deliberate baiting of Irish Catholics and only a spark was needed to set ablaze the smould-

Philadelphia

dering enmities of years. Kirlin well says in his "Catholicity in Philadelphia" that "the year 1844 is written black in the history of Philadelphia, because of the un-American and un-Christian scenes of violence that disgraced the traditions of the City of Brotherly Love." That the Philadelphia situation was deliberately created by ministers and members of the Presbyterian church no one who reads the contemporary sources will deny. The secular press of Philadelphia added to the turmoil by abusing day after day the "Irish Papists," the "miscreant Irish," the "degraded slaves of the Pople." It was a new, fresh vigorous and deadly chorus from Colonial days, and the refrain was always: "No Popery."

The riots that took place in Philadelphia in May and July, 1844, and the fearful disorders and bloodshed that ensued, we need not stop to describe. When calm came, St. Augustine's church was a blackened ruin, and in the ashes were the remains of one of the finest libraries in the United States. St. Michael's church had been burned and looted the day before, and it looked for a while as if every Catholic institution in the city would be destroyed. Bishop Kenrick took refuge with a Protestant clergyman and the Blessed Sacrament was removed from St. John's church to the house of another Protestant gentleman. "It was a heart-sickening sight," one of the newspapers said, "the like of which we hope we may never again look upon in this or in any other city--a sight mortifying and humiliating to those who have been taught to believe that our laws afford equal and efficient protection to all."

Let the truth be told--there was no remorse in the ranks of the Native Americans. Their three newspapers, "The Native Eagle," "The Native American," and "The Daily Sun," continued to cry for more violence and outrage upon the Catholics of the city.

Terrorism of Nativists.

All efforts were now to be directed towards a great public demonstration on July Fourth, 1844. That day and night, all Catholic churches and rectories were protected by the police and by volunteer bands, and during the next week the city was terrorized by the marauding "Nativists" clamoring for a show of force. Bloodshed again occurred, and the situation became so unmanageable that a messenger was sent to Washington to ask the President to dispatch troops at the earliest moment. Fortunately, the military forces in the city were able to enforce a cessation of the mob violence.

The Philadelphia riots frightened the entire country and Nativism was never able to recover its influence in local or national politics. A national convention of the Party was held at Philadelphia in July, 1845, and the principles was adopted that "no foreigner, hereafter coming to these UNited States, shall be allowed to exercise the elective franchise, until he shall have become a resident here at least twenty-five years." This was to become a plank in the platform of the Know-Nothing Party within the next decade.

This first attempt to settle the Catholic Question in the United States by an appeal to force ended in rioting, burning of churches, and bloodshed. All true Americans of the day were ashamed. Good men of all Protestant denominations deplored the fearful deeds of the fanatics who were responsible. The "Shame of Massachusetts" had grown more forbidding as the "Shame of Philadelphia" arose, and the shadow of intolerance lay heavy upon the land. Only one good result came out of it all--the league against Catholicism was discredited after five months of existence. There were those in Protestant circles who recalled for the benefit of the fanatics that the Gordon Riots in London in 1780 marked the precise beginning of Catholic growth and prosperity in England.

Article XXl--The Catholic Question Before The Provincial Councils--1829-1849.

(Our Sunday Visitor, May 27, 1928)

Nothing can be more significant in a serious study of the Catholic Question in the United States than a knowledge of the policy followed by our hierarchy during those twenty years (1829-1849) when the anti-Catholic Puritan frenzy was stalking the land. It so happens that during these same years the Church in the United States was administered practically through one provincial center--Baltimore. During these years there were held at Baltimore seven Provincial Councils which were attended by all our bishops and leading theologians. These Councils took cognizance of the anti-Catholic spirit at work in the land and at the end of each Council a Pastoral Letter was issued in order to bring to the faithful the results of the various sessions and congregations of the Councils. No problem in Catholic life and action was neglected by our prelates, and it is quite evident as we read over these Pastoral Letters that the animosity towards the Church was thoroughly analyzed in some of these Provincial assemblies.

The Pastoral Letter of 1829, which has already been quoted in these pages, says that "amongst the various misfortunes to which we have been exposed, one of the greatest is misrepresentation of the tents, the principles and the practices of our Church." The prelates acknowledged how difficult it was to account for the origin and continuance of this evil; they merely reminded Catholics of this melanchly fact. What saddened our bishops was the fact that good men, well-informed in science, history,politics and government were all apparently so influenced by the extraordinary efforts being made to discredit the Church, that it seemed hopeless to bring them to a more favorable frame of mind. The public press, popular literature and even school books were all tinged with this anti-Catholic bias. But, in spite of the growing aversion to the Catholic Faith, the bishops of 1829 urged our people to hold fast to the dictates of Christian charity, to return blessing for reviling, and to pray for a better day when non-Catholics would become better enlightened on our doctrines and join with Catholic leaders in promoting religious peace in the United States.

Pastoral of 1833.

Between 1829 and 1833, when the Second Provincial Council was held, the attacks upon the Church had become more vic-

ious, and our bishops expressed their profound regret that "a spirit exhibited by some of the conductors of the press, engaged in the interests of those brethren separated from our communion, has become more unkind and unjust in our regard." What wearied Catholic apoligists, then, as has wearied them ever since, was the fact that "the hundred times refuted calumnies of days of angry and bitter contention in other lands" were being repeated by the Evangelical press here as if they were new discoveries of the Church's "iniquity." But, in spite of the miserable unrest these calumnies caused, the bishops insisted with our Catholic people upon the necessity of keeping ever present before their eyes the principles and practice of the Church not to render evil for evil or railing for railing."We are too well-known to our fellow-citizens," the Pastoral Letter of 1833 says, "to render it now necessary that we should exhibit the utter want of any ground upon which such charges could rest. We, therefore, advise you to heed them not, but to continue, whilst you serve your God with fidelity, to discharge, honestly, faithfully, and with affectionate attachment, your duties to the government under which you live, so that we may, incommon with our fellow-citizens, sustain that edifice of rational liberty in which we find such excellent protection."

Alarming Growth of Intolerance.

The four years which intervened between the Second and Third Provincial Councils (1833-1837) witnessed an alarming growth of anti-Catholic intolerance. We have but to recall the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834, the publication of those vile books by Rebecca Reed and Maria Monk, in which the honor of priests and the nuns was so obsenely attacked, and the formation of the Native-American Party, to realize that the Puritan Party's spirit of religious fanaticism was rising to a height that approached the bigotry of colonial days. The truth is that the Catholic laity and clergy were seriously alarmed for their safety and for the protection of their churchesand institutions. They could not honestly depend upon the city or state government to hold back their enemies, for the "shame of Massachusetts" proved too conclusively that when this enlightened state deliberately refused justice to its Catholic citizens, other states, especially where illiterate Protestants abounded, would gladly follow Boston's example in blackeneing the fair name of American liberty.

The entire Pastoral Letter of 1837 may be said to deal with the growing persecution of Catholics. The Letter is from the pen of Bishop John England and is the bravest public document ever issued by the American hierarchy. Among the unhappy results of Puritan animosity, Americans were warned that the affection which should exist between all the citizens of the Republic was being undermined, that offices of charity were neglected and the kindly intercourse of neighbors interrupted and that suspicion, jealousy and hatred had succeeded to confidence, mutual respect, and love--"the demon of discord has usurped that station where the angel of peace abode, and that day has gone by, when every American citizen could truly say, that whatever may be the religious opinion which he entertained, or whatever the formof worship which he followed, he enjoyed in full freedom the opportunity of securing for himself what he vindicated for others--the communion with his God in that way which his conviction or his taste might prefer."

Catholic Freedom Menaced.

American Catholics in that year did not need to be reminded that there was fast approaching a concerted movement "to pluck the Catholic franchise from the frame of Constitution." But what was needed was to emphasize, in a way no Puritan mind could ignore, the fact that to tamper with Catholic political freedom would loosen the entire framework of the Constitution and facilitate the entrance of anarchy into government. One thing was certain, and in this Catholics saw a certain amount of safety--they could not be despoiled of their liberty without insuring the general ruin of the Republic. There was, then, no actual fear that civil disfranchisement of Catholics would occur, but what was feared was that "the pestilential blasts," arising from this thwarted hatred, would "contaminate our atmosphere, endanger the peace of society, disturb the domestic circle and drive charity from amongst us."

Pitiable it was to all fair-minded Americans to witness "men who assumed the garb of religion and who affect extraordinary zeal and extravagant piety," setting forth to the public as solemn truths, statements "whose falsehood they could have easily, detected, and of which it is scarcely possible to imagine them ignorant." But again, our bishops counselled patience in the tribulations which had come upon the Church in the United States. They emphasized the only "vengeance allowable by divine law--to love one's enemies, to do good to them that hated Catholicism, to pray for them that were persecuting and calumniating the Church of God, and to exhibit in conduct the high Christian virtue of charity towards all and of malice towards none.

Catholic Declaration of Religious Independence.

The Pastoral Letter of 1837 deserves to be known by every Catholic in the land. It gives in the clearest language ever penned by our hierarchy the fundamental basis of Catholic allegiance to the American Republic--namely, that Catholics do not owe and never will owe the slightest religious allegiance to any State in the Union or to any Federal government, and that every effort on the part of the State or Federal governments to control the Catholic conscience in matters of religious concernments will be resisted to the bitter end.

The passage in which this declaration of independence from governmental interference in religious matters occurs deserves to be placed where every Catholic boy and girl in our schools may read it and learn of the courage of his forebears in the faith.

If it were known throughout the length and breadth of the land, Catholics would cease the useless and unprofitable task of trying to prove their loyalty to a Puritan mentality which does not intend to be convinced of our patriotism. If it were known and repeated word for word, the light might dawn at last upon anti-Catholic groups that no man or woman, no society, no political party, and no arm of the government has any business to meddle in what is an inalienable right, superior to either national or state power, the right to worship God in freedom. This sounds bold and reads more boldly, but it is the voice of the prelates of 1837 that speaks.

Shame of Massachusetts.

Efforts were made between 1837 and 1840, when the Fourth Provincial Council, assembled, to bring a sense of justice to the Massachusetts State Legislature,but in vain. The whole country realized that Massachusetts had no intention of protecting the property of its Catholic citizens or of vindicating the majesty of its own laws. The escutcheon of that State was stained by "the recollection of that foul deed," of 1834, but redress for the Charlestown nuns was denied; in fact has ever since been denied. The prelates of 1840 did not mince their words in dealing with a State, "the cr~~e~~adle of our liberties, the first field of honor of our federation," that refused to wash away "a spot which blackens her own fame." The Pastoral Letter of 1840 speaks plainly of the effect the obscene and impure anti-Catholic

literature would undoubtedly have upon the minds of the young people, and the prelates especially pilloried "the polluting romances" then spread broadcast to vilify the priests and the nuns. The bishops of 1840 feared that "continued misrepresentations, the repetition of refuted calumnies, unkind efforts to create hostile feelings against us in the public mind, and bitter vituperation with expressions of censure and contempt," were calculated to arouse Catholics to a fighting spirit; and this danger was all the nearer, owing to the unprecedented growth of the Church through the immigration of the previous decade. Again the bishops counselled patience and silence and deprecated all bitterness and anger, indignation and clamor on the part of the faithful.

Change in Catholic Policy.

The short Pastoral Letter of 1843 is singularly silent--was it because Bishop John England was dead?--on the Catholic Question in the United States. There is absent in its pages any forewarning of the terrible outbreaks against the Catholic Faith which were to take place the following year under the leadership of the Native-American Party.

The year 1844 is the blackest page in the history of Puritan intolerance in America.

But, strange to say, when our prelates met at Baltimore in 1846, for the Sixth Provincial Council, they penned a Pastoral Letter in which not a line recalls the Terror of 1844.

The last of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore to legislate for the entire Church in the United States met in May, 1849, at Baltimore, and was attended by two Archbishops (Baltimore and St. Louis) and twenty-three bishops. There had been a recredescence of intolerance towards Catholics during the Mexican War and more than one libel was circulated regarding the loyalty of Catholic soldiers, but again silence reigns in the Pastoral Letter in 1849 on the ever-growing political movement against Catholic citizens. It is difficult to say whose was the dominating influence in these last two Provincial Councils, but evidently our bishops had reached the conclusion that the whole anti-Catholic agitation should be ignored. It is not precisely within our province to sit in judgment on this policy, but historical justice would be violated if the silence of our hier-

archy, after Bishop England's death in 1842, on Puritan intolerance were not viewed in the light of the Know-Nothing movement of the '50's. How perilously Catholics came during the decade before the Civil War to losing their rights as American citizens is patent to all who read the contemporary sources.

108387

BQX4321
+G8
v.1

108387

Guilday, Peter Keenan

The Catholic question
in the United States

DATE	ISSUED TO
MY 20'70	Ted Faison III
DE 1'78	Cinquegrani

ARCHABBEY LIBRARY
M +BQX4321.G8 v.1
Guilday, Peter The Catholic question i
3 0764 0011 8931 0